

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, May 4, 1994

The House met at 2 p.m.

Rabbi Moshe Feller, director, Upper Midwest Merkos-Lubavitch, Twin Cities, MN, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Members of this august body, the U.S. House of Representatives, convene here to fulfill one of the seven Biblical commandments which You issued to all mankind: that all societies must govern by just laws.

At the dawn of civilization, as related in Genesis and its sacred commentaries, You issued seven commandments which came to be known as the Seven Noahide Laws:

To worship You alone and not to serve idols,
Never to blaspheme Your Holy Name,
Not to murder,
Not to commit adultery,
Not to steal,
Not to be cruel to any living creature, and

That every society govern by just laws which are based in the recognition of You, O God, as the Sovereign Ruler of all men and nations.

Grant us, Almighty God, that those assembled here to enact the laws which govern this blessed country be cognizant of Your presence, and conduct their deliberations accordingly. Bless them with good health, wisdom, compassion, good cheer, and good fellowship. May they constantly realize that in laboring for the enactment of just laws they are doing Your will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 257, nays 154, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—257

Abercrombie	Furse	Mineta
Ackerman	Geddeson	Minge
Andrews (ME)	Gephardt	Mink
Andrews (NJ)	Geren	Moakley
Andrews (TX)	Gibbons	Mollohan
Applegate	Gillmor	Montgomery
Bacchus (FL)	Gillman	Murtha
Baesler	Glickman	Nadler
Barca	Gonzalez	Neal (MA)
Barcia	Gordon	Neal (NC)
Barlow	Green	Oberstar
Barrett (WI)	Greenwood	Obey
Bateman	Gutierrez	Oliver
Becerra	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Beilenson	Hall (TX)	Orton
Berman	Hamburg	Owens
Bevill	Hamilton	Pallone
Bilbray	Harman	Parker
Bishop	Hastert	Pastor
Blackwell	Hastings	Payne (NJ)
Bonior	Hayes	Payne (VA)
Borski	Hefner	Pelosi
Boucher	Hilliard	Penny
Brewster	Hinchey	Peterson (FL)
Browder	Hoagland	Peterson (MN)
Brown (FL)	Hochbrueckner	Pickett
Brown (OH)	Holden	Pickle
Bryant	Houghton	Pombo
Byrne	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Calvert	Hughes	Poshard
Cantwell	Hutto	Price (NC)
Cardin	Inglis	Rahall
Carr	Inslee	Reed
Chapman	Jefferson	Reynolds
Clayton	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Clinger	Johnston	Rose
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Rostenkowski
Coleman	Kasich	Rowland
Collins (IL)	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Collins (MI)	Kennelly	Rush
Combest	Kildee	Sabo
Condit	Kingston	Sanders
Conyers	Kleczka	Sangmeister
Cooper	Klink	Sarpalius
Coppersmith	Kopetski	Sawyer
Costello	Lambert	Schenk
Coyne	Lancaster	Schumer
Cramer	Lantos	Scott
Danner	LaRocco	Serrano
Darden	Laughlin	Sharp
de la Garza	Lehman	Shepherd
Deal	Levin	Sisisky
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
DeLauro	Lipinski	Skelton
Derrick	Livingston	Slattery
Deutsch	Lloyd	Slaughter
Dicks	Lowey	Smith (IA)
Dingell	Maloney	Smith (NJ)
Dixon	Mann	Snowe
Dooley	Manton	Spratt
Durbin	Margolies	Stark
Edwards (CA)	Mezvinsky	Stenholm
Edwards (TX)	Markey	Strickland
Engel	Martinez	Studds
English	Matsui	Stupak
Eshoo	Mazzoli	Swett
Evans	McCloskey	Swift
Everett	McCrery	Synar
Farr	McCurdy	Tanner
Fazio	McDermott	Tauzin
Fields (LA)	McHale	Tejeda
Filner	McKinney	Thompson
Fingerhut	McNulty	Thornton
Fish	Meehan	Thurman
Flake	Meek	Torres
Foglietta	Menendez	Torricelli
Ford (MI)	Mfume	Towns
Ford (TN)	Miller (CA)	Trafiacant
Frank (MA)	Miller (FL)	Tucker
Frost		Unsoeld

Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer

Waters
Watt
Waxman
Williams
Wilson

Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—154

Allard	Goss	Paxon
Archer	Grams	Petri
Armey	Gunderson	Porter
Bachus (AL)	Hancock	Portman
Baker (CA)	Hansen	Pryce (OH)
Baker (LA)	Hefley	Quillen
Ballenger	Herger	Quinn
Barrett (NE)	Hobson	Ramstad
Bartlett	Hoekstra	Ravenel
Barton	Hoke	Regula
Bentley	Horn	Roberts
Bereuter	Huffington	Rogers
Bilirakis	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Bliley	Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen
Blute	Hyde	Roth
Boehert	Inhofe	Roukema
Boehner	Istook	Royce
Bonilla	Jacobs	Santorum
Bunning	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Burton	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer
Buyer	Kim	Schiff
Callahan	King	Schroeder
Camp	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Knollenberg	Shaw
Castle	Kolbe	Shays
Clay	Kreidler	Shuster
Coble	Kyl	Skeen
Cox	Lazio	Smith (MI)
Crane	Leach	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Levy	Smith (TX)
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Solomon
DeLay	Lewis (FL)	Spence
Diaz-Balart	Lightfoot	Stearns
Dickey	Linder	Stump
Dornan	Machtley	Sundquist
Dreier	Manzullo	Talent
Duncan	McCandless	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Ehlers	McDade	Thomas (CA)
Emerson	McHugh	Thomas (WY)
Ewing	McInnis	Torkildsen
Fawell	McKeon	Upton
Fowler	Meyers	Vucanovich
Franks (CT)	Mica	Walker
Franks (NJ)	Michel	Walsh
Gallely	Molinar	Weldon
Gallo	Moorhead	Wolf
Gekas	Morella	Young (AK)
Gilchrest	Murphy	Zeliff
Gingrich	Nussle	Zimmer
Goodlatte	Oxley	
Goodling	Packard	

NOT VOTING—21

Brooks	Johnson (GA)	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Kaptur	Ridge
Collins (GA)	LaFalce	Stokes
Dellums	Long	Washington
Doolittle	McMillan	Wheat
Fields (TX)	Moran	Whitten
Grandy	Myers	Young (FL)

□ 1429

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi and Mr. BAKER of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CARR of Michigan and Mr. BARLOW changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VOLKMER). Will the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. ROHRBACHER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4204. An act to designate the Federal building located at 711 Washington Street in Boston, Massachusetts, as the "Jean Mayer Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging."

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the 13th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1305. An act to make boundary adjustments and other miscellaneous changes to authorities and programs of the National Park Service.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2000) an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to carry out the Head Start Act and the Community Services Block Grant Act, and for other purposes, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. PELL, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. COATS, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RABBI MOSHE FELLER

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Rabbi Moshe Feller and to thank him for his thoughtful opening prayer for today's session. Rabbi Feller has been a leader in the Twin Cities Jewish Community for over 30 years. Accompanying the Rabbi today are 20 students from the Chabad

[Habad] Academy located in St. Paul, MN.

Over the past 30 years, Rabbi Feller has been a strong voice for the Jewish community. He is the founder of the Chabad Academy. This school is located in St. Paul and educates students from preschool through junior high.

In addition, Rabbi Feller is the founder of the Bais Chana Women's Institute, the Shma Yisroel radio program and the Lubavitch Cheder Day School. The rabbi is one of the founders of the Adath Israel Synagogue.

Rabbi Feller has informed me that Rebbe Menachem Mendel Schneerson, the Lubavitcher Rebbe, remains critically ill. Many Members of Congress have cosponsored resolutions proclaiming the Rebbe's birthday as "Education Day—U.S.A." I know that my colleagues will want to join with me in prayer for the Rebbe's health and speedy recovery.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I also would like to welcome Rabbi Feller to the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 218, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. SABO submitted the following conference report and statement on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 103-490)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218), setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1995, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1995.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 2. Aggregates.

Sec. 3. Social security.

Sec. 4. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY PROCEDURES

Sec. 21. Sale of government assets.

Sec. 22. Social security fire wall point of order in the Senate.

Sec. 23. Enforcing pay-as-you-go.

Sec. 24. Enforcing discretionary spending limits.

Sec. 25. Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative.

Sec. 26. Adjustments for health care reform in the House of Representatives.

Sec. 27. Deficit-neutral reserve fund in the Senate.

Sec. 28. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

Sec. 31. Controlling growth of entitlement or mandatory spending.

Sec. 32. Sense of the House regarding enactment of certain budget process legislation.

Sec. 33. Sense of the Senate on controlling non-social security mandatory spending.

Sec. 34. Sense of the Congress regarding the budgetary accounting of health care reform.

Sec. 35. Sense of the Congress on the costs of illegal immigration.

Sec. 36. Sense of the Congress regarding base-lines.

Sec. 37. Sense of the Congress regarding unfunded Federal mandates.

Sec. 38. Closing of loopholes in foreign tax provisions.

Sec. 39. Sense of the Senate regarding tax expenditures.

Sec. 40. Sense of the Congress regarding health service delivery and water infrastructure in the Indian Health Service.

Sec. 41. Sense of the Senate regarding the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Sec. 42. Minimum allocation program.

Sec. 43. Policy in Eastern and Central Europe.

Sec. 44. Star Wars (Ballistic Missile Defense).

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 2. AGGREGATES.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—(A) For purposes of comparison with the maximum deficit amount under sections 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(i) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$977,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,031,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$1,079,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$1,136,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$1,190,200,000,000.

(ii) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$0.

Fiscal year 1996: \$0.

Fiscal year 1997: \$0.

Fiscal year 1998: \$0.

Fiscal year 1999: \$0.

(iii) The amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$100,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$106,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$111,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$117,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$123,700,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund)—

(i) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$877,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$924,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$967,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,018,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,066,500,000,000.

(ii) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$0.
Fiscal year 1996: \$0.
Fiscal year 1997: \$0.
Fiscal year 1998: \$0.
Fiscal year 1999: \$0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—(A) For purposes of comparison with the maximum deficit amount under sections 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,238,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,308,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,374,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,443,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,526,900,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund), the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,144,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,207,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,262,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,321,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,389,700,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—(A) For purposes of comparison with the maximum deficit amount under sections 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,217,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,284,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,356,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,418,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,490,900,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund), the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,124,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,184,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,246,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,297,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,355,600,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—(A) For purposes of comparison with the maximum deficit amount under sections 601(a)(1) and 606 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$239,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$253,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$276,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$281,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$300,700,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund), the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$247,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$259,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$278,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$278,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$289,100,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$4,965,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$5,281,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$5,618,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,958,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$6,308,800,000,000.

(6) DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$26,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$32,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$33,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$35,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$37,800,000,000.

(7) PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$199,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$174,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$164,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$164,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$163,500,000,000.

SEC. 3. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$360,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$379,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$399,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$419,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$439,800,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$287,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$301,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$312,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$324,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$337,000,000,000.

SEC. 4. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1995 through 1999 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$263,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$270,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$255,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$261,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$252,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$256,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$258,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$256,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, \$265,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$257,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$16,500,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,400,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$8,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$117,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$10,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$103,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$3,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$95,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$2,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$96,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$99,500,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,600,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$57,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$53,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$5,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$19,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$58,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$55,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$14,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$59,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$58,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$61,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$60,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$12,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$62,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$11,200,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$124,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$122,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$136,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$135,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$151,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$149,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$166,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$165,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$184,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$182,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$162,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$160,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$180,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$178,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$198,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$196,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$217,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$215,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$242,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$239,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(13) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund:

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$56,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$73,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$81,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$80,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$92,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(14) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$220,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$221,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$235,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$229,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$249,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$242,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$261,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$253,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$273,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$264,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(15) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(16) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$32,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$27,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,300,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,300,000,000.

(17) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(18) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,900,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(19) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$247,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$247,100,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$267,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$267,200,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$282,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$282,700,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$298,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$298,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$315,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$315,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(20) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$257,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$257,600,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$278,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$278,000,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$293,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$293,500,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$309,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$309,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$325,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$325,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(21) The corresponding levels of gross interest on the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$311,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$331,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$347,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$365,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$384,100,000,000.

(22) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, -\$6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$4,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, -\$4,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$3,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, -\$4,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$3,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, -\$7,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$7,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, -\$8,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$11,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(23) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, -\$44,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$44,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, -\$30,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$30,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, -\$30,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$30,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, -\$31,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$31,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, -\$31,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$31,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(24) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act, Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, -\$42,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$42,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, -\$27,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$27,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, -\$27,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$27,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, -\$28,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$28,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, -\$28,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$28,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY PROCEDURES

SEC. 21. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS.

(a) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) from time to time the United States Government should sell assets; and

(2) the amounts realized from such asset sales will not recur on an annual basis and do not reduce the demand for credit.

(b) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—For purposes of points of order under this concurrent resolution and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the amounts realized from sales of assets (other than loan assets) shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "sale of an asset" shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990); and

(2) the term shall not include asset sales mandated by law before September 18, 1987, and routine, ongoing asset sales at levels consistent with agency operations in fiscal year 1986.

(d) SUNSET.—Subsections (a) through (c) of this section shall expire September 30, 1998.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8 of House Concurrent Resolution 64 (103d Congress), section 8 of House Concurrent Resolution 287 (102d Congress), section 7 of House Concurrent Resolution 121 (102d Congress), section 5 of House Concurrent Resolution 310 (101st Congress), section 6 of House Concurrent Resolution 106 (101st Congress), section 4 of House Concurrent Resolution 268 (100th Congress), and sections 7 and 8 of House Concurrent Resolution 93 (100th Congress) are repealed.

SEC. 22. SOCIAL SECURITY FIRE WALL POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) APPLICATION OF SECTION 301(i).—Notwithstanding any other rule of the Senate, in the Senate, the point of order established under section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply to any concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year (as reported and as amended), amendments thereto, or any conference report thereon.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 10(b) of House Concurrent Resolution 64 (103d Congress) and section 12(b) of House Concurrent Resolution 287 (102d Congress) are repealed.

SEC. 23. ENFORCING PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Senate declares that it is essential to—

(1) ensure continued compliance with the deficit reduction embodied in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993; and

(2) continue the pay-as-you-go enforcement system.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct-spending or receipts legislation (as defined in paragraph (3)) that would increase the deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods (as defined in paragraph (2)) as measured pursuant to paragraphs (4) and (5).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "applicable time period" means any one of the three following periods—

(A) the first fiscal year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) the period of the 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(C) the period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) DIRECT-SPENDING OR RECEIPTS LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "direct-spending or receipts legislation" shall—

(A) include any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report to which this subsection otherwise applies;

(B) exclude concurrent resolutions on the budget;

(C) exclude full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990;

(D) exclude emergency provisions so designated under section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985;

(E) include the estimated amount of savings in direct-spending programs applicable to that fiscal year resulting from the prior year's sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, if any (except for any amounts sequestered as a result of a net deficit increase in the fiscal year immediately preceding the prior fiscal year); and

(F) except as otherwise provided in this subsection, include all direct-spending legislation as that term is interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall use the baseline used for the most recent concurrent resolution on the budget, and for years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution, shall abide by the requirements of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that references to "outyears" in that section shall be deemed to apply to any year (other than the budget year) covered by any one of the time periods defined in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(5) PRIOR SURPLUS AVAILABLE.—If direct-spending or receipts legislation increases the deficit when taken individually (as a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, as the case may be), then it must also increase the deficit when taken together with all direct-spending and receipts legislation enacted after the date of enactment of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, in order to violate the prohibition of this subsection.

(c) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be

equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(f) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 12 of House Concurrent Resolution 64 (103d Congress) is repealed.

(g) **TECHNICAL CORRECTION.**—Notwithstanding section 275(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as amended by sections 13112(b) and 13208(b)(3) of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990), the second sentence of section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (except insofar as it relates to section 313 of that Act) and the final sentence of section 904(d) of that Act (except insofar as it relates to section 313 of that Act) shall continue to have effect as rules of the Senate through (but no later than) September 30, 1998.

(h) **SUNSET.**—Subsections (a) through (e) of this section shall expire September 30, 1998.

SEC. 24. ENFORCING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) **DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**—

(1) **DEFINITION.**—For the purposes of enforcing this section in the Senate, the discretionary spending limits in section 601(a)(2)(F) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as adjusted) are reduced by the following amounts—

(A) with respect to fiscal year 1996, \$4,000,000,000 in budget authority and \$5,400,000,000 in outlays;

(B) with respect to fiscal year 1997, \$10,700,000,000 in budget authority and \$2,400,000,000 in outlays; and

(C) with respect to fiscal year 1998, \$4,100,000,000 in budget authority and \$500,000,000 in outlays.

(2) **POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.**—(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, 1997, or 1998 (or amendment or motion on such a resolution) that recommends discretionary spending levels for the first fiscal year covered by that resolution that would exceed the discretionary spending limits as reduced in this section.

(B) This subsection shall not apply if a declaration of war by the Congress is in effect or if a joint resolution pursuant to section 258 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 has been enacted.

(b) **WAIVER.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(c) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the concurrent resolution, bill, or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SEC. 25. INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE COMPLIANCE INITIATIVE.

(a)(1) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—For purposes of points of order under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 and concurrent resolutions on the budget—

(A) the discretionary spending limits under section 601(a)(2) of that Act (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year and each outyear;

(B) the allocations to the Committees on Appropriations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of that Act;

(C) the appropriate budgetary aggregates in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(D) the maximum deficit amount under section 601(a)(1) of that Act (and that amount as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year, shall be adjusted to reflect the amounts of additional new budget authority or additional outlays (as defined in paragraph (2)) reported by the Committee on Appropriations in appropriations Acts (or by the committee of conference on such legislation) for the Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative activities in any fiscal year, but not to exceed in any fiscal year \$405,000,000 in new budget authority and \$405,000,000 in outlays.

(2) **ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.**—As used in this section, the terms "additional new budget authority" or "additional outlays" shall mean, for any fiscal year, budget authority or outlays (as the case may be) in excess of the amounts requested for that fiscal year for the Internal Revenue Service in the President's Budget for fiscal year 1995.

(b) **REVISED LIMITS, ALLOCATIONS, AND AGGREGATES.**—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate or the House of Representatives (as the case may be) shall submit to that Chairman's respective House appropriately revised—

(1) discretionary spending limits under section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (and those limits as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year and each outyear;

(2) allocations to the Committees on Appropriations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of that Act;

(3) appropriate budgetary aggregates in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(4) maximum deficit amount under section 601(a)(1) of that Act (and that amount as cumulatively adjusted) for the current fiscal year, to carry out this subsection. These revised discretionary spending limits, allocations, and aggregates shall be considered for purposes of congressional enforcement under that Act as the discretionary spending limits, allocations, and aggregates.

(c) **REPORTING REVISED SUBALLOCATIONS.**—The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives may report appropriately revised suballocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(1) and 602(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

(d) **CONTINGENCIES.**—

(1) The Internal Revenue Service and the Treasury Department have certified that they are firmly committed to the principles of privacy, confidentiality, courtesy, and protection of taxpayer rights. To this end, the Internal Revenue Service and the Treasury Department have explicitly committed to initiate and implement educational programs for any new employees hired as a result of the compliance initiative made possible by this section.

(2) This section shall not apply to any additional new budget authority or additional outlays unless—

(A) in the Senate, the Chairman of the Budget Committee certifies, based upon information from the Congressional Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, and the Internal Revenue Service (as well as from any other sources he deems relevant), that such budget authority or outlays will not increase the total of the Federal budget deficits over the next five years; and

(B) any funds made available pursuant to such budget authority or outlays are available only for the purpose of carrying out Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative activities.

SEC. 26. ADJUSTMENTS FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) In the House of Representatives, if health care reform legislation is reported (including by a committee of conference), budget authority, outlays, and new entitlement authority shall be allocated to committees, and the total levels of budget authority, outlays, and revenues shall be adjusted, to reflect such legislation if the legislation in the form in which it will be considered would not increase the total deficit for the period of fiscal years 1995 through 1999.

(b) Upon reporting of legislation described in subsection (a) and again upon submission of a conference report on such legislation, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall publish in the Congressional Record revised allocations under section 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues to carry out this section. In the House of Representatives, such allocations and totals shall be considered as the allocations and aggregates under this resolution.

SEC. 27. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

(a)(1) **BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS.**—In the Senate, budget authority and outlays may be allocated (as provided under subsection (c)) to a committee (or committees) for direct-spending legislation that increases funding for any of the purposes described in subsection (b)(1) within that committee's jurisdiction, if, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(A) fiscal year 1995; or

(B) the period of fiscal years 1995 through 1999.

(2) **BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS AND REVENUE AGGREGATES.**—In the Senate, budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee (or committees) and the revenue aggregates may be reduced (as provided under subsection (c)) for direct-spending or receipts legislation in furtherance of any of the purposes described in subsection (b)(2) within that committee's jurisdiction, if, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(A) fiscal year 1995; or

(B) the period of fiscal years 1995 through 1999.

(3) **OUTLAY-NEUTRAL BUDGET AUTHORITY ALLOCATIONS.**—In the Senate, budget authority may be allocated (as provided under subsection (c)) to a committee (or committees) for any direct-spending legislation within that committee's jurisdiction, if, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed outlay reductions) the deficit or aggregate outlays in this resolution for—

(A) fiscal year 1995; or
(B) the period of fiscal years 1995 through 1999.

(b)(1) **PURPOSES UNDER SUBSECTION (a)(1).**—Budget authority and outlay allocations may be revised under subsection (a)(1) for legislation—

(A) to provide comprehensive training or job search assistance (including reemployment or job training programs or dislocated worker programs), or to reform unemployment compensation, or to provide for other related programs;

(B) to preserve or rebuild the United States maritime industry;

(C) to reform the financing of Federal elections; or

(D) to reform the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980.

(2) **PURPOSES UNDER SUBSECTION (a)(2).**—Budget authority and outlay allocations may be revised or the revenue floor reduced under subsection (a)(2) for—

(A) legislation to improve the well-being of families through welfare or other reforms (including promoting self-sufficiency through improvements in job training or employment programs), to provide for services to support or protect children (including assuring increased parental support for children through improvements in the child support enforcement program), or to improve the health, nutrition, or care of children;

(B) to make continuing improvements in ongoing health care programs, to provide for comprehensive health care reform, to control health care costs, or to accomplish other health care reforms;

(C) trade-related legislation (including legislation to implement the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or to extend the Generalized System of Preferences);

(D) reforms relating to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (including legislation to improve the funding of government-insured pension plans, to protect plan participants, or to limit growth in exposure of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation) or other employee benefit-related legislation;

(E) reforms relating to providing for simplified collection of employment taxes on domestic services;

(F) reforms to consolidate the supervision of depository institutions insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; or

(G) initiatives to preserve United States energy security.

(c) **REVISED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—

(1) **UPON REPORTING.**—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on that legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised aggregates to carry out this section.

(2) **ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.**—If the chairman of the Committee on the Budget submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (b)(2)(B), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such a submission, the chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised aggregates, if the enactment of that legislation (as proposed to be amended) will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(A) fiscal year 1995; or

(B) the period of fiscal years 1995 through 1999.

(d) **EFFECT OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates submitted under subsection (c) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(e) **REPORTING REVISED SUBDIVISIONS.**—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised subdivisions of allocations pursuant to sections 302(b)(2) and 602(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

SEC. 28. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 31. CONTROLLING GROWTH OF ENTITLEMENT OR MANDATORY SPENDING.

It is the sense of the Congress that legislation should be enacted providing enforceable limits to control the growth of entitlement or mandatory spending.

SEC. 32. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING ENACTMENT OF CERTAIN BUDGET PROCESS LEGISLATION.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the following legislation should be enacted:

(1) Legislation providing enforceable limits to control the growth of entitlement or mandatory spending.

(2) Amendments to the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 to establish a regular procedure to provide assistance for disasters and other emergencies without adding to the deficit.

(3) Legislation granting the President expedited rescission authority over appropriations measures, as provided by H.R. 1578, as passed the House.

SEC. 33. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONTROLLING NON-SOCIAL SECURITY MANDATORY SPENDING.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Congress should—

(1) after enacting health care reform legislation, enact annual caps to control the growth of entitlement or mandatory spending;

(2) include within these caps all mandatory spending programs except Social Security, deposit insurance, and net interest;

(3) provide that these caps shall be set so that programs providing benefits to individuals may grow for inflation, changes in the numbers of beneficiaries, and an additional growth allowance;

(4) provide that these caps shall be adjusted annually in the President's budget for changes in inflation and the number of beneficiaries since Congress enacted the caps (excluding any changes due to legislation);

(5) provide an enforcement mechanism in the event that total mandatory spending exceeds the caps; and

(6) enact caps on tax expenditures similar to those for mandatory spending so as to ensure that reductions in Federal spending for mandatory programs are not achieved by shifting spending to tax expenditures.

SEC. 34. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE BUDGETARY ACCOUNTING OF HEALTH CARE REFORM.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Congress should measure the costs and benefits of all health care reform legislation against a uniform set of economic and technical assumptions;

(2) before enacting major changes in the health care system, the Congress should have available to it reliable estimates of the costs of competing plans prepared in a comparable manner; and

(3) the Congress should account for all financial transactions associated with Federal health care reform legislation.

SEC. 35. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON THE COSTS OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal Government is solely responsible for setting and enforcing national immigration policy;

(2) the Federal Government has not adequately enforced immigration laws;

(3) this weak enforcement has imposed financial costs on State and local governments;

(4) the Federal Government has failed to investigate and prosecute Federal wage and hour violations, thus creating incentives to hire persons illegally in the United States and exacerbating the problem of illegal immigration;

(5) States must incur costs for incarcerating undocumented persons convicted of State and local crimes, educating undocumented children, providing emergency medical services to undocumented persons, and providing services incidental to admission of refugees under the Refugee Admissions and Resettlement Program; and

(6) the Federal Government has an obligation to reimburse State and local governments for costs resulting from the costs described in this subsection.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that, in setting forth the budget authority and outlay amounts in this resolution, the Congress intends that funding should be provided to reimburse State and local governments for the costs associated with—

(1) elementary and secondary education for undocumented children;

(2) emergency medical assistance to undocumented persons;

(3) incarceration and parole of criminal aliens; and

(4) services incidental to admission of refugees under the Refugee Admissions and Resettlement Program.

SEC. 36. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING BASELINES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) the baseline budget shows the likely course of Federal revenues and spending if policies remain unchanged;

(2) baseline budgeting has given rise to the practice of calculating policy changes from an inflated spending level; and

(3) the baseline concept has been misused to portray policies that would simply slow down the increase in spending as spending reductions.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President should submit a budget that compares proposed spending levels for the budget year with the current year; and

(2) the starting point for deliberations on a budget resolution should be the current year.

SEC. 37. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING UNFUNDED FEDERAL MANDATES.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Federal Government should not shift the costs of administering Federal programs to State and local governments;

(2) the Federal Government's share of entitlement programs should not be capped or otherwise decreased without providing States authority to amend their financial or programmatic responsibilities to continue meeting the mandated service; and

(3) Congress should develop a mechanism to ensure that costs of mandates are considered during agencies' development of regulations and congressional deliberations on legislation.

SEC. 38. CLOSING OF LOOPHOLES IN FOREIGN TAX PROVISIONS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds that—
(1) there is evidence suggesting that foreign-controlled corporations doing business in the United States do not pay their fair share of taxes;

(2) over 70 percent of foreign-controlled corporations doing business in the United States pay no Federal income tax;

(3) the United States Department of the Treasury has limited its ability to protect the revenue base in the case of cross-border transactions, to the detriment of taxpayers engaged solely in domestic transactions;

(4) the Department of the Treasury has been using antiquated accounting concepts to deal with sophisticated multinational corporations;

(5) substantial Federal revenues are lost annually due to the inability of the Internal Revenue Service to enforce the "arm's length" transaction rule, along with substantial amounts spent on administration and litigation; and

(6) the Federal income tax laws provide a financial incentive for domestic taxpayers to operate abroad by granting them deferral of United States taxes on income earned abroad.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that deficit reduction should be achieved, in part, by ending loopholes and enforcement breakdowns that now foster the underpayment of taxes on income from cross-border transactions and that subsidize the flight of domestic businesses and jobs out of the United States, by means including—

(1) the adoption of a more streamlined and efficient method of enforcing Federal tax laws involving multinational corporations, especially those based abroad, and in particular, the use by the Treasury Department of a formulaic approach in cases in which the current "arm's length" transaction rules do not work; and

(2) a repeal of tax subsidies for domestic businesses that operate abroad in tax havens and then ship their products back into the United States.

SEC. 39. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX EXPENDITURES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds that tax expenditures—

(1) are growing significantly;

(2) may have the same effect as direct Federal spending; and

(3) should be subject to the same level of budgetary review as direct spending.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Congress should consider targets for the growth in tax expenditures similar to the targets for the growth of mandatory spending;

(2) any reconciliation instructions included in a budget resolution should specify these targets; and

(3) such targets should be enforceable separately from any revenue targets included in the reconciliation instructions.

SEC. 40. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING HEALTH SERVICE DELIVERY AND WATER INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) sufficient funding should be provided to the Indian Health Service to ensure that Indian

Health Service hospitals and outpatient facilities in existence on the date of enactment of this resolution, and Indian Health Service hospitals and outpatient facilities scheduled to open during fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996, are fully staffed with the appropriate number of health care professionals needed to meet the health and medical needs of the American Indians and Alaska Natives who depend on the Indian Health Service for health care; and

(2) sufficient funding should be provided to the Indian Health Service to ensure that the Indian Health Service is capable of meeting basic public health and safety and sanitation requirements on Indian lands through timely and proper water infrastructure construction and upgrades.

SEC. 41. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that the budget authority and outlay figures for function 250 in this resolution do not assume any amounts for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for any fiscal year from 1995 through 1999 in excess of the amounts proposed by the President for such fiscal year.

SEC. 42. MINIMUM ALLOCATION PROGRAM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds that—

(1) the minimum allocation program was established in 1982 to address inequities in the funding formula for Federal-aid highways;

(2) the minimum allocation program was designed to provide the greatest degree of flexibility practicable to States that receive funding under the formula referred to in paragraph (1) and includes an exemption of the apportionments from the obligation ceiling;

(3) the minimum allocation program provides additional flexibility by allowing a State a 4-year period during which amounts apportioned to the State may be obligated;

(4) the budget of the United States Government for fiscal year 1995 submitted by the President to Congress proposes to include minimum allocation apportionments under the obligation ceiling and also proposes to limit the authority of States to obligate apportionments under the minimum allocation program to 67 percent of the amount of the apportionments; and

(5) States have planned transportation programs on the basis of the provisions of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, and the amendments made by the Act, relating to minimum allocation that confirmed core commitments to exemption and flexibility.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the minimum allocation program should remain exempt from the obligation ceiling; and

(2) the flexibility of the minimum allocation program should be an enduring and critical component of the provision of Federal assistance to States for Federal-aid highways.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—As used in this section:

(1) **FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS.**—The term "Federal-aid highways" has the meaning provided the term in section 101 of title 23, United States Code.

(2) **MINIMUM ALLOCATION PROGRAM.**—The term "minimum allocation program" means the program of allocation of funding to States under section 157 of title 23, United States Code.

(3) **OBLIGATION CEILING.**—The term "obligation ceiling" means the obligation ceiling under section 1002 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991.

SEC. 43. POLICY IN EASTERN AND CENTRAL EUROPE.

It is the sense of the Congress that levels of spending set forth in this resolution regarding the International Affairs (150) budget category include an assumption that the United States will oppose, consistent with provisions contained in the Freedom Support Act and the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act of 1994, attempts by the Russian Federation to intimidate, use military force or engage in economic coercion to establish a sphere of influence over the former republics of the Soviet Union, the Baltics, or Central and Eastern European nations.

SEC. 44. STAR WARS (BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE).

It is the sense of the Senate that given the Federal budget deficit, the real reductions in discretionary spending in this resolution, and the existence of many more worthy programs competing for this funding, spending for the Star Wars (Ballistic Missile Defense) must not exceed the fiscal year 1994 appropriated level.

And the Senate agree to the same.

MARTIN OLAV SABO,
DICK GEPHARDT,
DALE E. KILDEE,
ANTHONY BEILINSON,
HOWARD L. BERMAN,
BOB WISE,
JOHN BRYANT,
CHARLIE STENHOLM,
BARNEY FRANK,
LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM SASSER,
FRITZ HOLLINGS,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the Senate and the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (House Concurrent Resolution 218) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all of the House resolution after the resolving clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for the House resolution and the Senate amendment.

EXPLANATION OF CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

The following tables show the functional allocations and budget aggregates included in the conference agreement and the House-passed and Senate-passed versions of the resolution. In addition to on-budget figures, these tables include off-budget and total budget figures, which are shown for informational purposes only. Another table displays credit amounts by function. The conference agreement credit amounts are identical to those in both the House resolution and the Senate amendment.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
050 National defense:					
Budget Authority	263.8	255.3	252.0	258.7	265.1
Outlays	270.7	261.0	256.4	256.6	257.5
150 International affairs:					
Budget Authority	19.3	17.2	17.0	16.8	17.0
Outlays	18.1	17.3	17.3	17.6	17.5
250 Science, Space and Technology:					
Budget Authority	17.3	17.2	17.3	17.4	17.6
Outlays	17.2	17.2	17.3	17.3	17.5
270 Energy:					
Budget Authority	6.3	5.9	5.9	6.1	5.7
Outlays	5.0	5.2	5.0	4.7	4.4
300 Natural Resources:					
Budget Authority	21.7	22.2	22.1	22.0	21.6
Outlays	21.3	21.5	21.6	21.5	21.4
350 Agriculture:					
Budget Authority	13.0	13.5	14.0	14.2	14.7
Outlays	12.2	12.4	12.7	13.0	13.5
370 Commerce and housing credit:					
Budget Authority	9.7	6.5	6.2	7.2	7.7
Outlays	-7.7	-11.7	-3.4	-2.4	-1.2
On-budget:					
Budget Authority	7.7	5.3	5.1	5.2	6.2
Outlays	-8.2	-10.8	-3.4	-2.9	-0.9
Off-budget:					
Budget Authority	2.0	1.2	1.1	2.0	1.5
Outlays	0.5	-0.9	0.0	0.5	-0.3
400 Transportation:					
Budget Authority	41.9	41.8	43.2	44.0	44.6
Outlays	38.8	39.6	40.1	40.3	40.4
450 Community development:					
Budget Authority	9.5	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0
Outlays	9.3	8.9	9.0	9.1	9.0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services:					
Budget Authority	57.7	58.2	59.9	61.7	63.2
Outlays	53.7	55.6	58.1	60.6	62.2
500 Health:					
Budget Authority	124.3	136.7	151.0	166.7	184.2
Outlays	122.8	135.8	149.9	165.4	182.6
570 Medicare:					
Budget Authority	162.4	180.5	198.5	217.7	242.3
Outlays	160.5	178.2	196.1	215.1	239.1
600 Income security:					
Budget Authority	220.8	235.0	249.3	261.2	273.6
Outlays	221.2	229.6	242.9	253.2	264.6
650 Social Security:					
Budget Authority	339.2	355.5	374.6	393.3	413.1
Outlays	337.3	355.2	373.1	391.7	411.4
On-budget:					
Budget Authority	6.8	6.3	8.3	9.0	9.8
Outlays	9.4	9.4	11.5	12.3	13.2
Off-budget:					
Budget Authority	332.4	349.2	366.3	384.3	403.3
Outlays	327.9	345.8	361.6	379.4	398.2
700 Veterans benefits and services:					
Budget Authority	37.2	37.6	38.5	38.6	39.7
Outlays	36.6	36.6	38.3	38.5	39.6
750 Administration of justice:					
Budget Authority	18.8	21.3	22.2	23.2	24.5
Outlays	17.2	19.4	21.0	22.5	23.5
800 General government:					
Budget Authority	14.0	13.5	13.4	13.1	12.8
Outlays	13.7	14.7	13.9	13.4	12.8
900 Net interest:					
Budget Authority	213.6	229.8	240.9	251.7	263.3
Outlays	213.6	229.8	240.9	251.7	263.3
On-budget:					
Budget Authority	247.1	267.2	282.7	298.5	315.6
Outlays	247.1	267.2	282.7	298.5	315.6
Off-budget:					
Budget Authority	-33.5	-37.4	-41.8	-46.8	-52.3
Outlays	-33.5	-37.4	-41.8	-46.8	-52.3
920 Allowances:					
Budget Authority	-6.6	-4.4	-4.5	-7.9	-8.7
Outlays	-4.7	-3.9	-3.3	-7.1	-11.0
On-budget:					
Budget Authority	-6.6	-4.4	-4.5	-7.9	-8.7
Outlays	-4.7	-3.9	-3.3	-7.1	-11.0
Off-budget:					
Budget Authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts:					
Budget Authority	-43.2	-37.7	-38.1	-39.6	-40.5
Outlays	-43.2	-37.7	-38.1	-39.6	-40.5
On-budget:					
Budget Authority	-44.7	-30.5	-30.5	-31.3	-31.6
Outlays	-44.7	-30.5	-30.5	-31.3	-31.6
Off-budget:					
Budget Authority	1.5	-7.2	-7.6	-8.3	-8.9
Outlays	1.5	-7.2	-7.6	-8.3	-8.9
Total spending:					
Budget Authority	1,540.7	1,614.6	1,692.4	1,755.1	1,870.5
Outlays	1,513.6	1,584.7	1,668.8	1,743.1	1,827.9
On-budget:					
Budget Authority	1,238.3	1,308.8	1,374.4	1,443.9	1,526.9
Outlays	1,217.2	1,284.4	1,356.6	1,418.3	1,490.9
Off-budget:					
Budget Authority	302.4	305.8	318.0	331.2	343.6
Outlays	296.4	300.3	312.2	324.8	336.7
Revenues					
On-budget	1,338.2	1,410.8	1,478.7	1,555.9	1,630.0
Off-budget	977.7	1,031.2	1,079.7	1,136.4	1,190.2
Deficit	360.5	379.6	399.0	419.5	439.8
	175.4	173.9	190.1	187.2	197.6

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
On-budget deficit	239.5	253.2	276.9	281.9	300.7
Off-budget surplus	64.1	79.3	86.8	94.7	103.1
Public debt	4,965.1	5,281.4	5,618.2	5,958.6	6,308.8

HOUSE-PASSED BUDGET RESOLUTION—MARCH 11, 1994

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
050 National defense:					
Budget authority	263.3	255.3	252.0	258.7	258.7
Outlays	270.5	261.2	256.6	256.7	256.7
150 International affairs:					
Budget authority	19.2	17.2	17.0	16.8	17.0
Outlays	18.1	17.3	17.3	17.7	17.7
250 Science, Space and Technology:					
Budget authority	17.2	17.2	17.3	17.4	17.4
Outlays	17.1	17.2	17.3	17.4	17.4
270 Energy:					
Budget authority	6.0	5.9	5.9	6.1	5.4
Outlays	5.0	5.1	4.9	4.7	4.2
300 Natural Resources:					
Budget authority	21.4	22.2	22.1	22.0	21.6
Outlays	21.2	21.7	21.7	21.6	21.2
350 Agriculture:					
Budget authority	12.6	13.2	13.7	13.9	14.2
Outlays	11.9	12.1	12.4	12.7	13.1
370 Commerce and housing credit:					
Budget authority	9.3	6.5	6.2	7.2	6.7
Outlays	-8.0	-11.8	-3.5	-2.4	-2.2
On-budget:					
Budget authority	7.3	5.3	5.1	5.2	5.2
Outlays	-8.5	-10.9	-3.5	-2.9	-1.9
Off-budget:					
Budget authority	2.0	1.2	1.1	2.0	1.5
Outlays	0.5	-0.9	0.0	0.5	-0.3
400 Transportation:					
Budget authority	41.8	41.8	43.1	43.9	44.7
Outlays	38.8	39.6	40.1	40.3	40.3
450 Community development:					
Budget authority	9.5	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0
Outlays	9.3	8.9	9.0	9.1	9.1
500 Education, training, employment, and social services:					
Budget authority	57.0	58.2	59.9	61.7	61.8
Outlays	53.4	55.2	58.0	60.6	60.8
550 Health:					
Budget authority	123.4	136.6	150.9	166.6	182.9
Outlays	122.3	135.4	149.8	165.4	181.7
570 Medicare:					
Budget authority	162.4	180.5	198.5	217.7	242.2
Outlays	160.5	178.2	196.1	215.1	239.0
600 Income security:					
Budget authority	219.8	234.5	249.1	261.0	272.2
Outlays	220.4	229.1	242.6	253.1	264.1
650 Social Security:					
Budget authority	339.2	355.5	374.6	393.3	413.1
Outlays	337.3	355.2	373.1	391.7	411.3
On-budget:					
Budget authority	6.8	6.3	8.3	9.0	9.8
Outlays	9.4	9.4	11.5	12.3	13.1
Off-budget:					
Budget authority	332.4	349.2	366.3	384.3	403.3
Outlays	327.9	345.8	361.6	379.4	398.2
700 Veterans benefits and services:					
Budget authority	37.2	37.6	38.5	38.6	39.7
Outlays	36.6	36.6	38.3	38.5	39.7
750 Administration of justice:					
Budget authority	18.0	20.8	21.7	22.7	22.8
Outlays	16.8	19.1	20.6	22.1	22.1
800 General Government:					
Budget authority	13.7	13.5	13.4	13.1	13.2
Outlays	13.5	14.7	13.9	13.4	13.4
900 Net interest:					
Budget authority	213.6	229.8	241.0	251.7	263.5
Outlays	213.6	229.8	241.0	251.7	263.5
On-budget:					
Budget authority	247.1	267.2	282.8	298.5	315.8
Outlays	247.1	267.2	282.8	298.5	315.8
Off-budget:					
Budget authority	-33.5	-37.4	-41.8	-46.8	-52.3
Outlays	-33.5	-37.4	-41.8	-46.8	-52.3
920 Allowances:					
Budget authority	-0.8	-3.6	-3.6	-2.9	9.4
Outlays	-1.8	-2.1	-2.6	-6.1	-0.9
On-budget:					
Budget authority	-0.8	-3.6	-3.6	-2.9	9.4
Outlays	-1.8	-2.1	-2.6	-6.1	-0.9
Off-budget:					
Budget authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts:					
Budget authority	-42.9	-37.5	-37.9	-39.5	-40.5
Outlays	-42.9	-37.5	-37.9	-39.5	-40.5
On-budget:					
Budget authority	-36.1	-30.3	-30.3	-31.2	-31.6
Outlays	-36.1	-30.3	-30.3	-31.2	-31.6
Off-budget:					
Budget authority	-6.8	-7.2	-7.6	-8.3	-8.9
Outlays	-6.8	-7.2	-7.6	-8.3	-8.9

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE
HOUSE-PASSED BUDGET RESOLUTION—MARCH 11, 1994—Continued
 [In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Total spending:					
Budget authority	1,540.9	1,614.2	1,692.4	1,779.0	1,875.0
Outlays	1,513.6	1,585.0	1,668.7	1,743.8	1,831.7
On-budget:					
Budget authority	1,246.8	1,308.4	1,374.4	1,447.8	1,531.4
Outlays	1,225.5	1,284.7	1,356.6	1,419.0	1,495.0
Off-budget:					
Budget authority	294.1	305.8	318.0	331.2	343.6
Outlays	288.1	300.3	312.2	324.8	336.7
Revenues	1,338.3	1,410.8	1,478.7	1,555.9	1,630.0
On-budget	977.8	1,031.2	1,079.7	1,136.4	1,190.2
Off-budget	360.5	379.6	399.0	419.5	439.8
Deficit	175.3	174.2	190.0	187.9	201.7
On-budget deficit	247.7	253.5	276.8	282.6	304.8
Off-budget surplus	72.4	79.3	86.8	94.7	103.1
Public Debt	4,968.3	5,293.8	5,640.1	5,996.2	6,367.3

SENATE-PASSED BUDGET RESOLUTION—MARCH 25, 1994

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal Years—				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
050 National Defense:					
Budget Authority	262.8	225.3	252.0	258.7	265.1
Outlays	270.7	261.0	256.4	256.6	257.6
150 International Affairs:					
Budget Authority	19.3	17.2	17.0	16.8	17.0
Outlays	18.1	17.3	17.3	17.6	17.5
250 Science, Space & Technology:					
Budget Authority	17.3	17.2	17.3	17.4	17.6
Outlays	17.2	17.2	17.3	17.3	17.5
270 Energy:					
Budget Authority	6.3	5.9	5.9	6.1	5.7
Outlays	5.0	5.2	5.0	4.7	4.4
300 Natural Resources:					
Budget Authority	21.7	22.2	22.1	22.0	21.6
Outlays	21.3	21.5	21.6	21.5	21.4
350 Agriculture:					
Budget Authority	12.5	12.5	13.0	13.2	13.7
Outlays	11.8	11.4	11.7	12.0	12.5
370 Commerce and housing credit:					
Budget Authority	9.7	6.5	6.2	7.2	7.7
Outlays	-7.8	-11.7	-3.4	-2.4	-1.2
On-budget:					
Budget Authority	7.7	5.3	5.1	5.2	6.2
Outlays	-8.3	-10.3	-3.4	-2.9	-0.9
Off-budget:					
Budget Authority	2.0	1.2	1.1	2.0	1.5
Outlays	0.5	0.9	0.0	0.5	0.3
400 Transportation:					
Budget Authority	42.9	41.8	43.2	44.0	44.6
Outlays	38.8	39.6	40.1	40.3	40.5
450 Community development:					
Budget Authority	9.5	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0
Outlays	9.3	8.9	9.0	9.1	9.0
500 Education, training, employment and social services:					
Budget Authority	57.9	58.2	59.9	61.7	63.2
Outlays	53.6	55.7	58.2	60.6	62.2
550 Health:					
Budget Authority	124.3	136.7	151.0	166.7	184.2
Outlays	122.7	135.7	149.9	165.5	182.6
570 Medicare:					
Budget Authority	162.4	180.5	198.5	217.7	242.3
Outlays	160.5	178.2	196.1	215.1	239.1
600 Income security:					
Budget Authority	220.2	234.7	249.3	261.2	272.9
Outlays	220.7	229.3	242.8	253.2	264.4
650 Social Security:					
Budget Authority	339.2	355.5	374.6	393.3	413.1
Outlays	337.3	355.2	373.1	391.7	411.4
On-Budget:					
Budget Authority	6.8	6.3	8.3	9.0	9.8
Outlays	9.4	9.4	11.5	12.3	13.2
Off-budget:					
Budget Authority	332.4	349.2	366.3	384.3	403.3
Outlays	327.9	345.8	361.6	379.4	398.2
700 Veterans benefits and services:					
Budget Authority	37.2	37.6	38.5	38.6	39.7
Outlays	36.6	36.6	38.3	38.5	39.6
750 Administration of justice:					
Budget Authority	18.8	21.3	22.1	23.2	24.5
Outlays	17.3	19.4	21.1	22.5	23.5
800 General government:					
Budget Authority	14.0	13.5	13.4	13.1	13.5
Outlays	13.7	14.7	13.9	13.4	13.5
900 Net interest:					
Budget Authority	213.6	229.7	240.7	251.1	262.4
Outlays	213.6	229.7	240.7	251.1	262.4
On-Budget:					
Budget Authority	247.1	267.1	282.5	297.9	314.7
Outlays	247.1	267.1	282.5	297.9	314.7
Off-budget:					
Budget Authority	-33.5	-37.4	-41.8	-46.8	-52.3
Outlays	-33.5	-37.4	-41.8	-46.8	-52.3
920 Allowances:					
Budget Authority	-11.3	-8.6	-9.3	-12.5	-24.1
Outlays	-5.8	-3.9	-6.5	-12.0	-15.6
On-Budget:					
Budget Authority	-11.3	-8.6	-9.3	-12.5	-24.1
Outlays	-13.1	-3.9	-6.5	-12.0	-15.6

SENATE-PASSED BUDGET RESOLUTION—MARCH 25, 1994—Continued

(In billions of dollars)

	Fiscal Years—				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Off-budget:					
Budget Authority	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Outlays	7.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts:					
Budget Authority	-42.9	-37.5	-37.9	-39.5	-40.5
Outlays	-42.9	-37.5	-37.9	-39.5	-40.5
On-Budget:					
Budget Authority	-36.1	-30.3	-30.3	-31.2	-31.6
Outlays	-36.1	-30.3	-30.3	-31.2	-31.6
Off-budget:					
Budget Authority	-6.8	-7.2	-7.6	-8.3	-8.9
Outlays	-6.8	-7.2	-7.6	-8.3	-8.9
Total spending:					
Budget Authority	1,536.5	1,609.3	1,686.6	1,769.1	1,853.2
Outlays	1,511.7	1,583.5	1,664.7	1,736.8	1,821.8
On-Budget:					
Budget Authority	1,242.4	1,303.5	1,368.6	1,437.9	1,509.6
Outlays	1,216.3	1,283.2	1,352.5	1,412.0	1,485.1
Off-Budget:					
Budget Authority	294.1	305.8	318.0	331.2	343.6
Outlays	295.4	300.3	312.2	324.8	336.7
Revenues	1,338.2	1,410.8	1,478.7	1,555.9	1,630.0
Budget Authority	977.7	1,031.2	1,079.7	1,136.4	1,190.2
Outlays	360.5	379.6	399.0	419.5	439.8
Deficit	-173.5	-172.7	-186.0	-180.9	-191.8
Budget Authority	238.6	252.0	272.8	275.6	294.9
Outlays	65.1	79.3	86.8	94.7	103.1
Public debt	4,963.6	5,278.8	5,611.2	5,945.4	6,289.7

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT CREDIT LEVELS

(In billions of dollars)

	Fiscal years—				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Direct loans	26.7	32.1	33.8	35.7	37.8
Loan guarantees	199.7	174.4	164.6	164.1	163.5
050 National defense:					
Direct loans	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Loan guarantees	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
150 International affairs:					
Direct loans	3.2	2.8	2.6	2.4	2.4
Loan guarantees	18.0	18.5	18.5	18.5	16.5
250 General science, space and technology:					
Direct loans	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Loan guarantees	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
270 Energy:					
Direct loans	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Loan guarantees	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
300 Natural resources and environment:					
Direct loans	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Loan guarantees	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
350 Agriculture:					
Direct loans	10.1	9.7	9.7	9.8	9.9
Loan guarantees	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4
370 Commerce and housing credit:					
Direct loans	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.4
Loan guarantees	117.9	103.2	95.9	96.6	99.5
400 Transportation:					
Direct loans	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Loan guarantees	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
450 Community and regional development:					
Direct loans	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2
Loan guarantees	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
500 Education, training, employment and social services:					
Direct loans	5.5	11.5	13.2	15.1	16.8
Loan guarantees	19.0	14.0	13.2	12.3	11.2
550 Health:					
Direct loans	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Loan guarantees	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.0
570 Medicare:					
Direct loans	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Loan guarantees	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
600 Income security:					
Direct loans	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Loan guarantees	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
650 Social Security:					
Direct loans	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Loan guarantees	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
700 Veterans benefits and services:					
Direct loans	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5
Loan guarantees	32.9	27.4	25.8	25.6	25.3
750 Administration of justice:					
Direct loans	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Loan guarantees	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
800 General government:					
Direct loans	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Loan guarantees	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

ALLOCATIONS AMONG COMMITTEES

Sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 require the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on a concurrent resolution on the budget to include an allocation, based

upon that concurrent resolution as recommended in the conference report, of the appropriate levels of total outlays, new budget authority, entitlement authority (for the House only), and Social Security outlays (for the Senate only) among each committee

of the Senate and the House of Representatives that has jurisdiction over legislation providing those amounts. Section 602 further requires these allocations to include an allocation for the fiscal year covered by the resolution, as well as for the total for all 5

years covered by the resolution. These allocations provide the basis for congressional enforcement of the resolution through points

of order under the Congressional Budget Act. These allocations follow:

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1995

(In millions of dollars)

Appropriations Committee		Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
Current level (Enacted law):				
050	National defense	198	198	0
150	International affairs	174	174	0
300	Natural resources and environment	2,088	1,932	0
350	Agriculture	8,902	546	0
370	Commerce and housing credit	938	1,238	0
400	Transportation	571	574	0
500	Education, training, employment, and social services	12,280	12,059	0
550	Health	100,823	100,790	0
570	Medicare	42,896	42,896	0
600	Income security	77,792	78,012	0
650	Social Security	25	25	0
700	Veterans benefits and services	18,599	18,119	0
750	Administration of justice	398	394	0
800	General government	7,743	7,735	0
900	Net interest	57	57	0
Subtotal		273,484	264,750	0
Discretionary appropriations action (assumed legislation):				
050	National defense	264,321	271,102	0
150	International affairs	20,936	20,954	0
250	General science, space, and technology	17,300	17,153	0
270	Energy	6,475	6,488	0
300	Natural resources and environment	21,358	21,238	0
350	Agriculture	4,421	4,500	0
370	Commerce and housing credit	3,714	3,488	0
400	Transportation	15,211	38,348	0
450	Community and regional development	9,165	9,129	0
500	Education, training, employment, and social services	44,321	40,425	0
550	Health	23,119	22,237	0
570	Medicare	2,975	2,974	0
600	Income security	34,850	37,533	0
650	Social Security	0	2,590	0
700	Veterans benefits and services	17,926	17,742	0
750	Administration of justice	18,465	16,949	0
800	General government	12,801	12,546	0
920	Allowances	-6,504	-4,722	0
Subtotal		510,754	540,574	0
Discretionary action by other committees (assumed entitlement legislation):				
600	Income security	361	309	0
700	Veterans benefits and services	340	340	0
Subtotal		701	649	0
Committee total		784,938	805,972	0
AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
150	International affairs	-534	-534	0
270	Energy	13	-459	0
300	Natural resources and environment	514	519	0
350	Agriculture	8,416	7,308	7,924
400	Transportation	61	61	0
450	Community and regional development	324	280	0
600	Income security	0	0	1,142
800	General government	270	273	0
900	Net interest	0	0	57
Committee total		9,063	7,448	9,123
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
050	National defense	12,788	12,925	0
500	Education, training, employment, and social services	4	3	0
600	Income security	27,583	27,461	27,461
700	Veterans benefits and services	191	179	179
Committee total		40,566	40,568	27,640
BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
150	International affairs	-479	-1,355	0
370	Commerce and housing credit	2,935	-12,934	0
450	Community and regional development	2	-17	0
500	Education, training, employment, and social services	0	1	0
600	Income security	50	166	0
800	General government	-28	-22	0
900	Net interest	3,108	3,108	0
Committee total		5,587	-11,054	0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
750	Administrator of justice	44	44	44
Committee total		44	44	44
EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
500	Education, training, employment, and social services	905	1,010	4,095
600	Income security	122	1,130	9,437
Subtotal		1,026	1,130	13,532

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1995—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

Appropriations Committee		Budget au- thority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
Discretionary action (assumed legislation):				
600 Income security		0	0	309
Subtotal		0	0	309
Committee totals		1,026	1,130	13,841
ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
300 Natural resources and environment		0	-7	0
400 Transportation		11	9	0
550 Health		433	435	96,484
600 Income security		14,778	14,407	11,196
800 General government		8	8	0
Committee total		15,231	14,851	107,680
FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
150 International affairs		14,464	14,082	0
400 Transportation		7	18	0
600 Income security		479	479	468
800 General government		4	4	0
Committee total		14,954	14,582	468
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
800 General government		20	20	0
900 Net interest		87	87	0
Committee total		107	107	0
HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
500 Education, training, employment, and social services		19	17	0
700 Veterans benefits and services		2	2	0
800 General government		83	26	116
Committee total		104	45	116
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
370 Commerce and housing credit		152	152	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services		243	244	0
600 Income security		60	19	19
750 Administration of justice		1,328	1,360	173
800 General government		488	488	0
Committee total		2,270	2,262	191
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
300 Natural resources and environment		571	506	0
370 Commerce and housing credit		66	66	0
400 Transportation		14	-16	546
600 Income security		16	6	0
800 General government		7	7	0
Committee total		674	569	546
NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
270 Energy		167	-62	0
300 Natural resources and environment		158	99	0
450 Community and regional development		444	441	339
550 Health		5	5	0
800 General government		812	822	171
Committee total		1,585	1,304	510
POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
550 Health		0	-653	3,658
600 Income security		37,999	36,802	36,802
800 General government		13,308	13,308	0
Committee total		51,307	49,457	40,461
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
270 Energy		1,356	760	0
300 Natural resources and environment		225	188	0
400 Transportation		24,093	0	0
450 Community and regional development		5	168	0
800 General government		16	16	0
Subtotal		25,695	1,131	0
Discretionary action (assumed legislation):				
400 Transportation		2,161	0	0
Subtotal		2,161	0	0
Committee total		27,856	1,131	0
SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
250 General science, space, and technology		30	30	0

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SEC. 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1995—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Appropriations Committee	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
500 Education, training, employment, and social services		1	1	0
Committee total		31	31	0
SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
370 Commerce and housing credit		6	-104	0
450 Community and regional development		0	-279	0
Committee total		6	-383	0
VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
700 Veterans benefits and services		1,531	1,596	19,498
Subtotal		1,531	1,596	19,498
Discretionary action (assumed legislation):				
700 Veterans benefits and services		0	0	340
Subtotal		0	0	340
Committee total		1,531	1,596	19,837
WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE				
Current level (Enacted law):				
500 Education, training, employment, and social services		0	0	7,535
570 Medicare		183,258	181,302	177,368
600 Income security		39,966	39,095	80,609
650 Social Security		6,815	6,815	0
750 Administration of justice		450	450	0
800 General government		354	354	0
900 Net interest		314,285	314,285	314,285
Committee total		545,129	542,301	579,797
UNASSIGNED TO COMMITTEES				
Current level (Enacted law):				
050 National defense		-13,508	-13,524	0
150 International affairs		-15,261	-15,221	0
250 General science, space, and technology		-30	17	0
270 Energy		-1,711	-1,726	0
300 Natural resources and environment		-3,214	-3,175	0
350 Agriculture		-8,738	-154	0
370 Commerce and housing credit		-111	-105	0
400 Transportation		-229	-193	0
450 Community and regional development		-440	-422	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services		-73	-60	0
550 Health		-79	-14	0
570 Medicare		-66,729	-66,672	0
600 Income security		-13,256	-13,210	0
650 Social Security		-40	-30	0
700 Veterans benefits and services		-1,389	-1,377	0
750 Administration of justice		-1,884	-1,896	0
800 General government		-21,885	-21,885	0
900 Net interest		-70,438	-70,438	-55,752
920 Allowances		4	22	0
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts		-44,700	-44,700	0
Committee total		-263,710	-254,762	-55,752
Total—current level		724,684	675,978	743,854
Total—discretionary action		513,616	541,222	649
Grand total		1,238,300	1,217,200	744,502

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SECTION 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1995-99
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE						
Current level:						
Budget authority	273,484	270,468	302,357	328,114	359,693	1,534,116
Outlays	264,750	261,786	293,031	319,587	350,593	1,489,747
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	510,754	514,616	516,891	525,992	537,775	2,606,028
Outlays	540,574	542,642	544,855	546,689	548,226	2,722,986
Discretionary action by other committees:						
Budget authority	701	27,668	29,239	33,503	35,395	126,506
Outlays	649	27,019	29,177	32,850	35,213	124,908
Committee total:						
Budget authority	784,938	812,752	848,487	887,609	932,864	4,266,650
Outlays	805,972	831,447	867,063	899,126	934,032	4,337,640
AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	9,063	9,733	10,052	10,205	10,517	49,570
Outlays	7,448	7,569	7,660	7,791	8,067	38,535
New entitlement authority	0	1,150	1,204	1,237	1,270	4,861
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	40,566	42,771	45,038	47,484	50,760	226,619
Outlays	40,568	42,627	44,893	47,337	50,596	226,021

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SECTION 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—Continued

(By fiscal year, in millions of dollars)

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1995-99
BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	5,587	3,981	3,609	3,447	3,310	19,934
Outlays	-11,054	-13,068	-5,800	-5,677	-4,789	-40,388
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	44	47	50	53	56	250
Outlays	44	47	50	53	56	250
EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	1,026	532	351	176	97	2,182
Outlays	1,130	-733	-44	172	77	602
New entitlement authority	309	389	420	2,162	2,663	5,943
ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	15,231	15,552	15,873	16,141	16,349	79,146
Outlays	14,851	15,152	15,284	15,540	15,547	76,374
FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	14,954	12,507	11,584	10,489	9,683	59,217
Outlays	14,582	13,798	12,980	12,122	11,276	64,758
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	107	113	113	113	113	559
Outlays	107	113	113	113	113	559
HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	104	103	102	103	104	516
Outlays	45	203	23	20	49	340
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	2,270	2,180	2,284	2,404	2,528	11,666
Outlays	2,262	2,140	2,224	2,343	2,467	11,436
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	674	695	706	733	753	3,561
Outlays	569	632	642	673	705	3,221
NATIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	1,585	1,624	1,532	1,442	1,442	7,625
Outlays	1,304	1,510	1,527	1,444	1,371	7,156
POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	51,307	52,509	54,292	56,183	58,233	272,524
Outlays	49,457	50,532	52,263	54,080	56,058	262,390
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	25,695	25,198	27,278	1,488	767	80,426
Outlays	1,131	930	926	911	572	4,470
Discretionary action:						
Budget authority	2,161	2,161	2,161	28,750	29,508	64,741
Outlays	0	0	0	0	0	0
Committee total:						
Budget authority	27,856	27,359	29,439	30,237	30,275	145,166
Outlays	1,131	930	926	911	572	4,470
SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	31	31	31	31	31	155
Outlays	31	31	31	31	31	155
SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	6	3	4	3	3	19
Outlays	-383	-313	-249	-185	-154	-1,284
VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	1,531	1,470	1,445	1,344	1,272	7,062
Outlays	1,596	1,446	1,449	1,464	1,464	7,419
New entitlement authority	340	674	1,133	1,573	2,023	5,743
WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	545,129	588,303	628,675	671,199	719,529	3,152,835
Outlays	542,301	585,182	625,435	667,765	715,576	2,136,259
New entitlement authority	0	0	0	0	214	214
UNASSIGNED TO COMMITTEE						
Current level (Enacted law):						
Budget authority	-263,710	-263,466	-279,269	-295,496	-311,017	-1,412,958
Outlays	-254,762	-254,848	-269,872	-286,822	-302,214	-1,368,518
Total current level:						
Budget authority	724,684	764,355	826,109	855,655	924,221	4,095,024
Outlays	675,978	714,738	782,568	838,761	907,461	3,919,506
Total discretionary action:						
Budget authority	513,616	544,445	548,291	588,245	602,679	2,797,276
Outlays	541,222	569,661	574,032	579,539	583,439	2,847,893

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SECTION 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—Continued

(By fiscal year, in millions of dollars)

	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1995-99
Grand total:						
Budget authority	1,238,300	1,308,800	1,374,400	1,443,900	1,526,900	6,892,300
Outlays	1,217,200	1,284,400	1,356,600	1,418,300	1,490,900	6,767,400
Total new entitlement authority	649	2,214	2,757	4,972	6,170	16,762

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT BUDGET YEAR TOTAL: 1995

(Dollars in millions)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Appropriations	784,939	805,972	---	---
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	8,888	7,257	15,967	7,544
Armed Services	40,588	40,574	---	---
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	7,256	(10,994)	---	---
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	2,620	126	548	546
Energy and Natural Resources	1,751	1,489	43	36
Environment and Public Works	24,191	1,597	---	---
Finance	556,629	553,601	145,846	145,829
Foreign Relations	15,003	14,619	---	---
Governmental Affairs	51,458	49,609	---	---
Judiciary	2,270	2,262	173	173
Labor and Human Resources	4,330	4,265	4,337	4,162
Rules and Administration	102	43	---	---
Veterans Affairs	1,531	1,482	18,875	18,394
Select Indian Affairs	448	445	---	---
Small Business	6	(383)	---	---
Not allocated to committees	(263,710)	(254,764)	---	---
Total	1,238,300	1,217,200	185,789	176,684

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT FIVE YEAR TOTAL: 1995-99

(Dollars in millions)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	48,608	37,562	86,282	42,653
Armed Services	226,692	226,055	---	---
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs	32,143	(40,441)	---	---
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	13,152	569	3,066	3,051
Energy and Natural Resources	8,552	8,136	204	199
Environment and Public Works	123,341	7,165	---	---
Finance	3,213,173	3,194,730	888,895	889,099
Foreign Relations	59,238	64,761	---	---
Governmental Affairs	273,334	263,202	---	---

SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT FIVE YEAR TOTAL: 1995-99—Continued

(Dollars in millions)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Judiciary	11,666	11,436	948	946
Labor and Human Resources	18,851	16,413	19,965	19,187
Rules and Administration	509	332	---	---
Veterans Affairs	7,062	7,417	96,908	93,944
Select Indian Affairs	2,268	2,227	---	---
Small Business	19	(1,284)	---	---

SENATE COMMITTEE REVENUE AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY PURSUANT TO SECTION 301(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

(Dollars in millions)

	1995	Five-year 1995-99
Outlays:		
Finance Committee	334,761	1,853,217
Unassigned to Committee	(47,112)	(290,624)
Subtotal, outlays	287,649	1,562,593
Revenues	360,456	1,998,386

REPORT LANGUAGE

The conferees intend that, to the extent that this conference report does not modify it, language in the reports of the House and Senate Committees on the Budget on the concurrent resolution on the budget (H.R. Rep. No. 428, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. (1994); S. Rep. No. 238, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. (1994)) remains as a source of legislative history on the drafters' intent on the concurrent resolution.

FUNCTION 750: ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

The conferees recognize the judiciary's essential role in providing justice to all citizens and the ever-increasing workload and additional responsibilities thrust upon the judiciary. The conferees understand that the judiciary has no control over the number of cases that are filed in the courts, that it must handle each case filed, and that it has no flexibility in how quickly it must handle many of these cases.

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

(Calendar years)

	Actual 1993	Projected					
		1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Annual averages:							
Gross domestic product (billion dollars)	6,378	6,730	7,099	7,483	7,880	8,287	8,700
Percent change	5.6	5.5	5.5	5.4	5.3	5.2	5.0
Real GDP (percent change)	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.5
Inflation:							
GDP deflator (percent change)	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5
Consumer price index (percent change)	3.0	2.7	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1
Unemployment rate (percent) ¹	6.8	6.4	6.1	5.9	5.8	5.7	5.7
Interest rates:							
Three-month Treasury bill (percent)	3.0	3.5	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7
Ten-year Treasury note (percent)	5.9	5.8	6.0	6.1	6.2	6.2	6.2

¹ Pre-1994 basis. Due to a change in methodology, published rates are likely to be higher. The year-to-year change should not be affected.

The conferees recommend that the Appropriations Committee consider full funding for the judiciary even though the allocation for function 750 may not accommodate all of the requests in this area.

Finally, the conferees support adding three activities of the Federal judiciary to the list of Budget Enforcement Act mandatory accounts if any budget process changes are made this year: (1) Salaries of Court of Federal Claims and magistrate judges; (2) Fees paid to jurors; and (3) Compensation paid to court-appointed counsel for defendants financially unable to retain their own counsel. Under current legislative requirements, the judiciary has no discretion whether to perform these activities if the constitutional rights of individuals are to be assured.

FUNCTION 920: ALLOWANCES

The conferees are concerned that proposed reductions in the fiscal year 1995 pay adjustments may further undermine the goal of achieving pay comparability within the timeframe established by the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act of 1990. The conferees will work with the appropriate authorizing and appropriating committees to find acceptable alternative methods to fully fund the pay adjustments, such as a reduction in agency spending on service contracts.

The conferees believe that indirect cost reimbursements are an important, legitimate and necessary cost of conducting research, and the conference agreement does not include the proposed "pause." The conferees recommend that prior to taking any action on indirect costs, the Congress should await the joint report of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Council of Economic Advisors.

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

Section 301(g)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act requires the joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on a budget resolution to set forth the common economic assumptions upon which the joint statement and conference report are based. The conference agreement is based on the economic forecast and projections prepared by the Congressional Budget Office shown in the table below:

DISPLAY OF LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Following the form of the resolution for fiscal years 1993 and 1994, the Senate amendment sets forth a number of alternative displays. Section 5 of the Senate amendment displays, for enforcement purposes in the Senate, the levels of Social Security revenues and outlays. Section 6(21) of the Senate amendment shows the levels of gross interest consistent with the levels of net interest shown in major functional category 900, which appear in section 6(19) and 6(20) of the Senate amendment. As well, the Senate amendment follows the pattern of the budget resolution for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 in terms of demonstrating its compliance with the maximum deficit amount and its display of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund. The House resolution contains none of these additional displays. In these regards, the conference agreement follows the form of the resolution for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 for the reasons set forth in the conference report accompanying the 1993 budget resolution. See H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 529, 102d Cong., 2d Sess. 58-60 (1992); see also S. Rep. No. 238, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 46-48 (1994). With respect to other alternative displays in sections 3 and 4 of the Senate amendment, the Senate recedes to the House.

Following the form of resolutions for years prior to fiscal year 1994, the House resolution contains levels and amounts for secondary loan guarantee commitments. Following the form of the resolution for fiscal year 1994, the Senate amendment failed to set forth these levels and amounts. On this matter, the House recedes to the Senate.

BUDGETARY PROCEDURES

Title II of the resolution sets forth budgetary procedures under the general authority of section 301(b)(4) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

At the end of title II, section 26 of the Senate amendment explicitly states that the Congress adopts the provisions of title II as an exercise of the Constitutional rule-making power. The language of section 26 follows closely that of similar provisions in other rule-making budget process legislation, such as section 904(a) of the Congressional Budget Act, section 271(d) of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, section 13305 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 14004 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

Section 26(1) spells out that the provisions of title II have equal weight with those of the other rule-making budget process legislation. They are all rules of the Congress, or of the House of Congress to which they specifically apply.

Section 26(2) makes clear that either the Senate or the House of Representatives may change the provisions of title II that relate to that House, just as either may change the provisions of the other rule-making budget process legislation cited above that relate to that House, through a simple resolution passed by only that one House. Alternatively, Congress could choose to change these provisions using another concurrent resolution or a statute.

The House resolution contains no such provision.

Section 28 of the conference agreement contains the Senate language.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS

Section 21 of the Senate amendment sets out a provision on asset sales that is very similar to those in every budget resolution since that for fiscal year 1988.

This section is intended to prevent spending the proceeds from asset sales by prohibit-

ing the counting of asset sales for all purposes of the Congressional Budget Act and this resolution. This provision is consistent with section 257(e) of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, which prohibits the counting of asset sales for the purposes of determining whether that Act calls for across-the-board cuts. This section does not preclude asset sales; it merely prevents counting such transactions. The provision does not determine whether an action constitutes an asset sale; rather it adopts the definition of that term that exists in current law. (See Gramm-Rudman-Hollings §§ 250(c)(21) & 257(e).)

The House resolution has no such provision.

The conference agreement adopts the Senate language, except that the conference agreement drops as surplusage subsection (b) of the Senate amendment, which sets forth a finding regarding the history of similar provisions.

The operative provision, subsection (c) of the Senate amendment and subsection (b) of the conference agreement, follows the language from last year's budget resolution in that it extends the prohibition of counting asset sales to all sections of the Congressional Budget Act, as well as to the points of order created by this resolution. The conferees thus intend the rule on asset sales to be uniform for the consideration of all legislation.

This section supersedes any previously adopted scorekeeping rules of the Senate or the House (for example, the Congressional Budget Act definition of "outlays") to the extent that they were inconsistent.

Section 21(e) of the Senate amendment, now section 21(d) of the conference agreement, sunsets all prior subsections of section 21 on September 30, 1998, the date on which most operative sections of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings will expire under current law. The conferees thus intend that the asset-sales rule established in the resolution have the same longevity as the parallel rule in section 257(e) of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

Section 21(f) of the Senate amendment, now section 21(e) of the conference agreement, repeals sections of prior budget resolutions dealing with the same subject matter. Some of these provisions differ from those of section 21 in small ways, and thus repealing the older provisions will eliminate any ambiguity in interpreting section 21.

SOCIAL SECURITY "FIRE WALL" POINT OF ORDER

Section 22 of the Senate amendment repeats a provision from the last two budget resolutions that reinforces the Social Security "fire wall" point of order in the Senate to ensure that 60-vote hurdles impede legislation that would worsen the Social Security Trust Fund balances.

The House resolution contains no such provision.

The conference agreement includes the provision for the reasons stated in the Senate report. See S. Rep. No. 238, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 51-53 (1994). The conference agreement drops as surplusage subsection (a) of the Senate amendment, which sets forth a finding regarding the history of similar provisions.

ENFORCING PAY-AS-YOU-GO

Section 12(c) of last year's budget resolution contained a new 60-vote point of order in the Senate prohibiting legislation that would increase the deficit through fiscal year 2003. The Senate amendment proposes that Congress again this year adopt a point of order in the Senate enforcing deficit neutrality for the next 10 years. Section 23 of the Senate amendment establishes that point of order.

The Senate amendment thus proposes to extend the point of order longer than under existing law. The point of order in last year's resolution went through fiscal year 2003. Section 23 of the Senate amendment covers 10 years out, and will cover 10 years out next year, the year after that, and the year after that.

The Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation have both informed the Committees on the Budget that they are incapable of making year-by-year estimates for the 6th through 10th years out. The solution to this dilemma proposed by the Senate amendment is to require deficit neutrality over the 5-year period of the 6th through 10th years out.

Section 23(c)(1) of the Senate amendment provides the operative enforcement language. As the report of the Senate Budget Committee makes clear (see S. Rep. No. 238, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 54-55 (1994)), section 23(c)(1) of the Senate amendment makes it out of order in the Senate to consider any direct-spending or receipts legislation that would increase the deficit in any of three specified periods both when taken individually and when taken together with all direct-spending and receipts legislation enacted after enactment of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Enacted August 10, 1993). If the individual piece of legislation would not increase the deficit in one of the relevant time periods, then it would not violate section 23(c)(1) of the Senate amendment. This practice of holding harmless a piece of legislation that does not harm the deficit parallels the treatment extended to legislation of that character under current law under sections 302(f)(2) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

As well, if the piece of legislation would not increase the deficit in any of the three relevant periods when taken together with all direct-spending and receipts legislation enacted after enactment of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, then it would not violate section 23(c)(1) of the Senate amendment. This practice of allowing one piece of legislation to use the surplus created by other legislation of the same type also parallels the treatment under sections 302(f)(2) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act, as well as accounting under the pay-as-you-go procedures of section 252 of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

The three time periods covered by section 23 of the Senate amendment are the first fiscal year covered by the most-recently-adopted concurrent resolution on the budget, the period of the 5 fiscal years covered by the most-recently-adopted concurrent resolution on the budget, and the period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 years covered by the most-recently-adopted concurrent resolution on the budget. Increasing the deficit in any of these three time periods is sufficient to trigger the point of order.

Section 23(c)(2) of the Senate amendment defines direct-spending and receipts legislation consistently with the treatment of that legislation under section 252(b) of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. Section 23(c)(3)(D) of the Senate amendment explicitly links direct spending to the definition of that term in section 250(c)(8) of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. Consequently, because section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 explicitly excludes Social Security from Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, Social Security is also excluded from the point of order under section 23.

Section 23(f) of the Senate amendment restates the normal budget law scorekeeping

convention that Congress turns to its Budget Committees to assess the costs of legislation. See Congressional Budget Act §§201(g), 302(g), 310(d)(4), 311(c), 313(e), 601(b)(3) & Gramm-Rudman-Hollings §258B(h)(4).

The House resolution contains no such provision.

The conference agreement proposes as section 23 language similar to that of section 23 of the Senate amendment.

The conference agreement drops as surplusage subsection (b) of the Senate amendment, which sets forth a finding regarding the history of similar provisions.

The conference agreement revises the operative language of subsection (c) of the Senate amendment as subsection (b) of the conference agreement. Some observers believed that the language of the Senate amendment could be clearer regarding the availability of any surplus that had been created by prior legislation since the enactment of the 1993 reconciliation law. Cf. 140 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD S3843 (daily ed. Mar. 25, 1994) (statements of Sens. Moynihan & Sasser clarifying that the surplus is available). The conference agreement rewrites this subsection to make plain that such surplus funds are available. This merely restates the explicit intent of the Senate amendment. See S. Rep. No. 238, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 54-55 (1994).

The conference agreement also rewrites subsection (c)(2)(D) of the Senate amendment as subsection (b)(3)(F) of the conference agreement to make clear that (except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)) the term "direct spending" means the same thing as that term means as applied for purposes of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law. The conferees thus wish to refer not only to section 250(c)(8) of that law as such (as the Senate amendment did), but also to the gloss put on that section by scorekeeping guideline 3 (H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 964, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. 1173 (1990), reprinted in 1990 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2374, 2878) and other, related scorekeeping practices.

Section 23(b)(4) of the conference agreement also spells out that in preparing estimates under this section, the estimators shall use the same baseline as Congress used for the most recent budget resolution. Recognizing that this resolution probably will cover only 5 years, subsection (b)(4) then extends this baseline out for years beyond those covered by the budget resolution, using the requirements of section 257 of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, which defines the baseline for that law. Subsection (b)(4) makes clear that references to "outyears" in section 257 of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings should be read for purposes of subsection (b)(4) to include the second through tenth years out, not just the second through fifth years out.

ENFORCING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

Section 25 of the Senate amendment effectively reduces the amount of money that the budget resolutions for fiscal year 1996, 1997, and 1998 may allocate to the Appropriations Committees. It does this by reducing the discretionary spending limits under section 601(a)(2)(F) of the Congressional Budget Act as amended by section 14002(a)(2) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, as those limits are adjusted, for purposes of a new point of order that applies only in the Senate. Section 25(a)(2) of the Senate amendment creates this point of order. Section 25(b) establishes a requirement for the affirmative vote of 60 Senators to waive this new point of order.

Section 25 of the Senate amendment parallels section 12(b), (d), (e), and (f) of last

year's budget resolution, which extended the appropriations caps through fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998. The drafters of section 12 of last year's budget resolution in turn patterned that section on several sections of the Congressional Budget Act. Consequently, section 25(a)(2)(A) of the Senate amendment is in turn patterned on section 601(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act as amended by section 14002(b) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993. Section 25(a)(2)(B) of the Senate amendment is in turn patterned on section 601(b)(4) of the Congressional Budget Act. Sections 25(b) and 25(c) of the Senate amendment are in turn patterned on sections 904(c) and 904(d) of the Congressional Budget Act, respectively. Section 25(d) of the Senate amendment restates the normal budget law scorekeeping convention that Congress turns to its Budget Committees to assess the costs of legislation, and is thus patterned on Congressional Budget Act sections 201(g), 302(g), 310(d)(4), 311(c), 313(e), and 601(b)(3), and Gramm-Rudman-Hollings section 258B(h)(4).

The House resolution contains no such provision.

The conference agreement includes as section 24 a revision of the language in section 25 of the Senate amendment.

The conference agreement revises the reductions in the discretionary spending limits as follows:

REDUCTIONS IN DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

(In billions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—		
	1996	1997	1998
Conference agreement:			
Budget authority	4.0	10.7	4.1
Outlays	5.4	2.4	0.5

Among other changes, the conference agreement revises references in subsections (a) and (d) that might have been read to apply the section to the House of Representatives.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE COMPLIANCE INITIATIVE

Section 54 of the Senate amendment allows for additional appropriations for an Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative. If the Congress appropriates the base amounts requested for the Internal Revenue Service in the President's Budget for fiscal year 1995 and a variety of other conditions are met, then Congress can also appropriate additional amounts for a compliance initiative without triggering points of order that might otherwise lie against such legislation.

Under sections 54(a) and 54(b) of the Senate amendment, upon the reporting of an appropriation bill funding the compliance initiative and the satisfaction of the conditions listed, the Chairman of the appropriate Budget Committee must file revised appropriations caps, allocations to the Appropriations Committee, functional levels, and aggregates to clear the way for the incremental spending for the initiative. This procedure parallels that used in reserve funds (discussed below), which allow deficit-neutral legislation to proceed without points of order even if that legislation pays for direct spending with revenues. Similarly, section 54 of the Senate amendment allows appropriations legislation to proceed without points of order if it is demonstrated that the revenues raised by those appropriations would offset the costs of the appropriations.

The first parenthetical language in the matter after subsection (a)(3) establishes the first condition precedent, that the Congress

appropriate the base amounts requested for the Internal Revenue Service in the President's Budget for fiscal year 1995. Subsection (d) lists the other conditions: enactment of a Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2, initiation of an Internal Revenue Service educational program as mandated by the Taxpayer Bill of Rights 1 and 2, a finding by the Congressional Budget Office that by virtue of revenues raised, the appropriations will not increase the deficit, and a restriction of funds made available pursuant to this authority to carrying out Internal Revenue Service compliance initiative activities.

The House resolution contains no such provision.

The conference agreement contains as section 25 a provision similar to that in section 54 of the Senate amendment. In particular, section 25(a)(2) of the conference agreement more explicitly spells out the condition precedent that Congress first appropriate the base amounts requested for the Internal Revenue Service in the President's Budget for fiscal year 1995 before the provisions of this section apply. Similarly, the conference agreement revises subsection (d), which sets forth the other conditions precedent.

DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUNDS

Section 4 of the House resolution provides for adjustment of the aggregates and committee allocations to accommodate health care reform legislation, when reported, if the legislation would be deficit neutral over 5 years. Section 24 of the Senate amendment provides similar language, called a "reserve fund," allowing consideration of legislation in the Senate addressed to several specified priority areas, if the legislation would be deficit neutral over 1 and 5 years. In the Senate, reserve funds may pave the way for tax-cutting legislation paid for with spending cuts, new spending legislation paid for with taxes, or spending legislation paid for with cuts in another committee's jurisdiction. See S. Rep. No. 238, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 34-36 (1994).

Section 26 of the conference agreement contains reserve fund language for the House similar to that in the House resolution and section 27 of the conference agreement contains reserve fund language for the Senate similar to that in the Senate amendment.

The Senate reserve fund language in the conference agreement collapses without substantive change several subsections into a smaller number of paragraphs, eliminating the repetition of language. With three minor exceptions, the conferees intend that the conference agreement language shall have identical effect to the Senate-passed language.

In addition to the provisions covered by the Senate amendment, the conference agreement adds a general provision to allow adjustments of budget authority in the Senate where legislation would result in absolutely no increase in outlays over the applicable periods. Such provisions necessarily do not worsen the deficit. An example of such legislation in the past is the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, for which the Chairman of the Budget Committee filed two budget authority adjustments. See 137 Cong. Rec. S18,663 (daily ed. Nov. 27, 1991); id. at S7511-12 (daily ed. June 11, 1991).

Like the Senate amendment, the Senate reserve fund language in the conference agreement requires the Chairman of the Budget Committee to submit revised allocations and aggregates to accommodate amendments relating to health care reform, if the Chairman has already submitted re-

vised allocations and aggregates to accommodate a committee-reported bill. The conference agreement makes clear that the Chairman is required to make such submissions only when the amendment necessitates such a submission. In other words, if the amendment would not violate the revised allocations and aggregates already submitted, the Chairman need not submit new ones. If, however, an amendment deals with the appropriate subject matter and is deficit neutral over the appropriate time periods, but would nonetheless cause a breach of a revised allocation or aggregate, the Chairman must submit further revised allocations and aggregates to accommodate that amendment.

Finally, the conference agreement changes the treatment of the reserve fund for health care (described in subsection (b)(2)(B) of the conference agreement) to make clear that the language allows tax-cutting legislation paid for with spending cuts (as well as spending legislation paid for with new taxes, or spending legislation paid for with cuts in another committee's jurisdiction, or any combination). The conference agreement thus lists that purpose in subsection (b)(2), among purposes for which spending cuts may pay for tax cuts, rather than in subsection (b)(1), which lists purposes for which spending cuts may not pay for tax cuts.

Because the provisions of these Senate reserve funds are part of the congressional budget, they apply only to budget authority, outlays, and receipts to which a budget resolution may permissibly apply. Consequently, these reserve funds do not apply to Social Security outlays or Social Security revenues, which section 13301(a)(2) of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 explicitly excludes from the congressional budget.

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS AND SIMILAR PROVISIONS

The House resolution contains four sense of the Congress provisions, on budget process legislation (section 5), a reserve for emergencies (section 8), unfunded mandates (section 9), and baselines (section 10). The House resolution also contains two sense of the Budget Committee provisions, on scoring health reform (section 6) and immigration (section 7).

The Senate amendment contains 11 sense of the Congress provisions, on the budgetary accounting of health care reform (section 31), the costs of illegal immigration (section 32), baselines (section 33), economic assumptions (section 34), unfunded Federal mandates (section 35), the Indian Health Service (section 38), the minimum allocation program (section 41), Federal law enforcement personnel (section 45), minerals management (section 48), Star Wars (section 51), and shifting the allocation of anti-drug funds from international anti-drug programs to drug treatment and prevention programs (section 53). The Senate amendment also contains 13 sense of the Senate provisions, on foreign tax provisions (section 36), tax expenditures (section 37), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (section 39), the Spending Reduction Commission (section 40), payments to United Nations of United States arrearages in contributions for peacekeeping activities (section 42), Eastern and Central Europe (section 43), Federal courthouse construction (section 44), that taxes not be increased because taxpayers are married (section 46), Department of Energy reductions-in-force (section 47), diesel fuel dyeing regulations (section 49), equitable distribution of reductions in defense and non-defense discretionary spending (section 50), growth of enti-

tlement or mandatory spending (section 52), and controlling non-Social Security mandatory spending (section 55).

The conference agreement contains seven sense of the Congress provisions on: controlling entitlement spending (section 31), budgetary accounting of health care reform (section 34), the costs of illegal immigration (section 35), baselines (section 36), unfunded federal mandates (section 37), health service delivery and water infrastructure in the Indian Health Service (section 40), and policy in Eastern and Central Europe (section 43).

The conference agreement also contains six sense of the Senate provisions on: controlling non-Social Security mandatory spending (section 33), closing loopholes in foreign tax provisions (section 38), tax expenditures (section 39), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (section 41), the minimum allocation program (section 42), and Star Wars (section 44).

The conference agreement contains one sense of the House of Representatives provisions on the enactment of budget process legislation (section 32).

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT IN THE HOUSE

Rule XLIX of the Rules of the House of Representatives establishes a procedure for changing the statutory limit on the level of the public debt.

This budget resolution sets forth the appropriate level of the statutory limit for the coming fiscal year, 1995, as well as the out-years. Under House Rule XLIX, upon adoption by both Houses of Congress of a conference report on a budget resolution containing a debt level for the next fiscal year, the public debt limit for that year is incorporated into the text of a joint resolution. Pursuant to the rule, that joint resolution would amend section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, by striking out the dollar limitation contained in such subsection and replacing it with the figure of \$4,965,100,000,000.

Under the rule, that joint resolution is then deemed passed by the House and sent to the Senate for its consideration. If the Senate approves the joint resolution without amendment, the joint resolution is sent to the President for his signature. (If the Senate were to amend the joint resolution, the measure would be returned to the House for further action.)

Legislative jurisdiction over the public debt remains in the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule does not preclude that committee from originating public debt legislation.

MARTIN OLAV SABO,
DICK GEPHARDT,
DALE E. KILDEE,
ANTHONY BEILSON,
HOWARD L. BERMAN,
BOB WISE,
JOHN BRYANT,
CHARLIE STENHOLM,
BARNEY FRANK,
LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM SASSER,
FRITZ HOLLINGS,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3222

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 3222.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

SMALL BUSINESS AND HEALTH CARE

(Mr. DERRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, why do we need health care reform?

Besides the 35 to 40 million Americans with no health care plan at all, there is health care's stratospheric cost on the Government and economy.

Health care costs already anchor our national debt. If we do not take action, they will hobble the small businesses that drive our economy.

On average, small businesses pay 35 percent more for health plans than large employers. Health care costs have risen 20 to 50 percent for small businesses, and the burden of worker's compensation is increasing at 1½ times the rate of health care costs.

Health care reform will ease this pressure. Small, low wage businesses will receive discounts of between 25-85 percent on health care costs, allowing the smallest employers to provide affordable, effective health care insurance.

Nine out of ten Americans get their private health insurance at work. America's small businesses are the place to begin real health care reform.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 140

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 140.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE A TO Z CIRCUS: WILL YOU BE BUYING A TICKET?

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the A to Z spending cuts plan and urge all of my colleagues who take deficit reduction seriously to sign the discharge petition which allows this legislation to reach the floor for a vote.

A to Z is untraditional, but we have all seen where the traditional budget process has taken us—right into debt. By allowing Members to propose, debate, and then vote on specific program cuts in nonpackage form, A to Z forces every Member to go on record as to what programs he or she is willing to

cut for the sake of America's economic future. Simply put, the folks throughout America will see exactly who is serious about reducing wasteful Government spending by looking at the names on the A to Z discharge petition.

I have heard the A to Z plan compared to a three-ring circus. I just might agree. In ring 1, if the legislation reaches the floor, we will be stressing Government spending in terms of responsibility. In ring 2, we have accountability. And, in ring 3, we will introduce an aspect of Government spending rarely seen—affordability. A circus of fiscal responsibility. Pitch the big-top tent, because Americans have been waiting for years to see this.

I urge all of my colleagues to sign the discharge petition for A to Z. Talking about reducing Government spending does nothing but allow Members to hide under a blanket of false deficit reduction commitment. Strong, innovative legislative action like A to Z is the only way to honestly address our Government's financial problems. Three-ring circus? I'll be buying a ticket and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

A TO Z IS PHONY REFORM

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the A to Z bill is being touted as reform legislation, but it is nothing of the kind. A to Z is phony reform. It is a bill that would limit congressional debate and thwart the public will.

The 56-hour debate limit of A to Z would mean that amendments could be voted on without serious debate or considered review. The result would be disastrous for this institution and this country.

By circumventing the committee system, A to Z would mean Congress would be forced to vote on legislation without the benefit of any public hearings. The committee process is designed to give citizens a voice in public policy debate. A government of, by and for the people cannot function if it ignores the people—that is what A to Z does.

Last year, this Congress passed the largest deficit reduction package in history—500 billion dollars' worth. This year, the most important action this Congress can take to put our fiscal house in order is to reform our health care system. If A to Z backers want to work for real reform then they should roll up their sleeves and do the tough work on health care reform, not take the easy way out. Real reform, not phony reform.

SIGN THE A TO Z DISCHARGE PETITION

(Mr. ZELIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, the failed budget provisions of the past have given us a \$4.5 trillion debt. It is time for change.

The A to Z spending cut plan places every program on the table for review. It allows us to cut entitlements, it allows us to make decisions to cut authorizations, it reduces spending caps, so that the spending cuts are real.

We must remove the budget gag rules that prohibit us from attacking the national debt.

Today is Congressional Accountability Day.

Many Members who ran for Congress pledged to cutting wasteful Government spending.

Others pledged to balance the budget. A lot of us pledged to cut the \$4.5 trillion debt.

Many of us pledged to reform Congress.

We promised to fight for change.

Most of us have talked the talk. Today is the day to walk the walk.

Today is the day to sign the A to Z spending cut discharge petition as almost 100 of our colleagues have done. Today we are accountable. Will it be business as usual? Or will we take a new road. Do we have the courage to stand up for real change? Today, by our actions, each of us will be accountable to the people of America.

□ 1440

CHILDREN AND POVERTY

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I received some truly frightening news this week, news that threatens the very core of America's future.

In my home State of North Carolina, it was revealed that the lives of our children have grown more and more treacherous over the last 5 years.

Today in North Carolina, it is dangerous to be a child. Listen, as I sound out the disgraceful statistics.

Each day in North Carolina, 3 babies die, 88 children are abused or neglected, 43 teenagers become pregnant, and 40 young people drop out of school.

In the four measures of social welfare—health, education, safety, and security—we have failed our children miserably.

In the last year alone, poverty among children increased 16 percent, the drop-out rate rose 10 percent; crime rates are up and so are arrests among juvenile offenders.

Mr. Speaker, this disgraceful situation is not limited to my State of North Carolina, it is a national tragedy. We cannot afford to lose this, our most valuable resource.

Let us commit ourselves today, to public policies that will rescue our children from these mean circumstances.

SUPPORT A TO Z SPENDING CUTS PLAN

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the A to Z spending cuts plan sponsored by my colleagues ROB ANDREWS and BILL ZELIFF. The taxpayers of America have asked us to cut wasteful Federal spending, and the A to Z plan offers us a unique opportunity to get the job done.

The idea is simple. Give Members a chance to offer up spending cuts and be guaranteed an up-or-down roll call vote. No part of the budget is off-limits. Every program is fair game. Pork projects can not be hidden deep in essential spending bills but will be measured on their merit before the entire country. It is kind of a congressional line item veto.

It is easy to understand why there have been a few vocal opponents of the A to Z plan. The issue here is power: Who gets to decide how the people's money is spent and how much is spent. The defenders of the status quo want to keep that power centralized. The A to Z plan will return spending decisions to the people and their duly elected Representatives.

To me this is not a hard choice. I side with the people of our country who are paying the bills and who are tired of wasteful spending. I urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition to the A to Z spending cuts plan.

WHICH CONSTITUTION WILL WE UPHOLD TODAY?

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, which Constitution will be upheld today in the U.S. Congress: the Constitution that said Jeffrey Dahmer, Richard Speck, Charles Manson are innocent until proven guilty; or today do we uphold the IRS constitution that says the PTA president, the teacher, the engineer, the truck driver, the housewife, mom and dad are guilty, considered guilty for tax fraud and tax evasion and they have to prove themselves innocent?

Shame, Congress, shame; there is only one Constitution. If it is good enough for the Son of Sam, it should be good enough for mom and dad. H.R. 3261, the Constitution says you are innocent until proven guilty. Congress, do your job.

PHONY SPENDING CUTS? A TO Z PLAN MAKES HONEST-TO-GOODNESS CUTS

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, it was fascinating to hear the lady from Connecticut stand up and talk about the A to Z spending plan being phony spending cuts. When you really get serious in Congress and make honest-to-goodness cuts from last year's spending, it is called phony? It has a kind of "Alice-in-Wonderland" quality about the words.

As Humpty Dumpty said, "When I use words, it means exactly what I want them to mean."

Over the last decade or so, we have had four different budgets in which serious reductions in spending were promised: 1982, immediate tax increases with spending cuts down the road; Gramm-Rudman, immediate tax increases with spending cuts in the out years; 1990, immediate tax increases with spending cuts in the out years; and the last out year occurred last year when we had the largest tax increase in history with no net spending cuts until the out year.

The A to Z plan currently before us, for which we are signing the discharge petition, gives the United States people and this Congress the opportunity to see that we are willing to make enough choices, to make real spending cuts.

No wonder it scares the devil out of the left.

ASSAULT WEAPONS MAKE NO SENSE

(Ms. SCHENK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, I recently heard a spokesman for guns argue that assault weapons ban makes no sense because guns that will be banned are no different than many others that will not be. I am not a weapons expert, and I do not know that fine difference between an Uzi and a street sweeper, but what I do know is that the 19 weapons banned by this legislation now make up 85 percent of all assault weapons traced to crime.

I also know that in San Diego, my community, a few weeks ago this type of weapon was used to injure a police officer during an 11-hour standoff with the SWAT team at an apartment complex.

Last October, at another apartment complex not far away, a similar assault weapon was used to kill a woman and a 9-year-old child. Both of these would be banned if this bill passes.

For those who say that "guns don't kill people, people kill people," let me paraphrase from the last campaign: "It is the guns, stupid."

ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, well, it is the people that kill and not the guns. I think it is time in America we start holding the people responsible. Banning guns, any kind of guns, will not do anything to curb crime. What it will do is promote a bigger black market for weapons. Most crimes committed with guns are committed with illegal guns, anyway. So, in effect, this law that we are talking about will not do anything; it is just another Band-Aid from Washington, DC, to try to fake out the Nation and take the spotlight right off the criminal. I tell you, guns are not doing the shooting. Let us see the real cause, and that is the criminals.

Government ought to concentrate on locking up the criminal, not imposing criminal penalties on law-abiding citizens. Gun bans have a long history of failure. They do not reduce crime; crime deterrence lies not in gun control but in the enforcement of laws that are already on the books. I know there is a crime problem in America, everyone of us does. We will not, any of us, say there is not a real problem. Until we hold the criminal, not society or guns, responsible, the crime rate is going to continue to go up. Until we pass a real anticrime bill, we have not gotten to the crux of the problem.

ANTIHYPOCRISY DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 1994

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing tomorrow an alternative to the so-called A to Z bill, which I call the Anti-Hypocrisy Deficit Reduction Act of 1994. Under my proposal, my bill will provide for the same 56 hours of consideration for proposals to cut spending as is provided by the A to Z bill, with two critical differences: No. 1, we will require at least 1 working week's notice of the amendment so there will be some opportunity to analyze proposals which will be offered. And, second, I would require the Speaker to recognize Members who will offer amendments reducing or eliminating projects within their own district. That is why I call it the Anti-Hypocrisy Deficit Reduction Act of 1994.

Instead of Members piously posing for political holy pictures by roundly denouncing spending in somebody else's district, I think they ought to be required to start in their own neighborhoods.

ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider H.R. 4296 which seeks to further restrict the right to own a firearm.

The effect this bill will be on is the law abiding citizen who is being told that while the criminal is the problem, the Federal government's solution is to restrict the rights of American citizens.

A few years ago the Federal Government told the American people that it only wanted to restrict the importation of assault weapons. Now, the Government wants to restrict the weapons made in the United States. Let me read to you a portion of a letter from Treasury Secretary Bentsen referencing the list of firearms which appear to meet the definition of semiautomatic assault weapons. He writes, "The list was compiled from currently advertised firearms and should not be considered to be all inclusive."

I submit this body could do more good for the country if it focused its attention on those whose behavior breaks the law, rather than restricting the legitimate rights of those who abide by them.

□ 1450

CRIME PREVENTION MONTH

(Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the efforts of over 27 million people across the country who are working to prevent crime in their neighborhoods and communities. Today, I am introducing legislation to commemorate their work by designating October 1994 as National Crime Prevention Month; more than 150 of my colleagues have already joined me in this endeavor.

Americans refuse to accept complacency. From education to neighborhood watch groups, they are committed to fighting back. To help these people in their efforts, we need to inform residents and make them aware of the difference individuals can make.

I am working with the National Crime Prevention Council to bring crime prevention to every household.

This effort to support the millions of Americans who have joined the battle against crime is a cost-free way to make a difference. These Americans have demonstrated that by working together, we can reduce crime, drug abuse and fear of crime.

This is a fight we can and must win for the sake of our families and our children.

SUPPORT THE A-Z SPENDING CUT BILL

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the A to Z spending cuts plan, and House Resolution 300, the rule which would allow open debate on spending cut amendments in H.R. 3266.

As an advocate of congressional reform, I have worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to achieve significant change, and I have found a bipartisan approach to be very effective. I believe that sensible spending cuts must also be enacted in a bipartisan fashion.

The A to Z bill would open up the budget process to the entire Congress by allowing Members to propose specific spending cuts, debate those cuts and vote on them, up or down; this legislation could be a real vehicle for spending reform.

I have signed the discharge petition, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

SMALL BUSINESS SPEAKS WITH A VOICE OF REASON ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, more than 340,000 small businesses came together to tell the truth about health care reform.

They formed a new small business coalition for health care reform—on behalf of more than 3 million hard-working Americans—builders and farmers, store-owners and salesmen, designers, and druggists. Because they believe it is time to move past all the rhetoric, all the posturing and press releases that have twisted this issue beyond recognition.

The simple fact is that health care reform is good business for small business. It will save money. It will make a real difference in people's lives. They know it, and we know it.

It is good for the small businesses that offer health coverage, but have to pick up the tab for their competitors who do not.

It is good for the small businesses that can't afford to cover their employees, but will finally be able to do so—thanks to the big discounts they will get when reform becomes reality.

And health care reform is good for the small businesses that believe decent, affordable health care is not just a line on a spreadsheet—it is our obligation as a society.

The fact is, today's soaring health care costs—today's discriminatory insurance practices—are strangling millions of small businesses. They need a voice in this process. And frankly, the small business lobbyists do not speak for most of them.

That is why they came out in support of health care reform. They know that if they do not stand up and speak for themselves, their voice will be lost in the chorus of hype and hyperbole that is trying to defeat real reform.

But do not take it from me, listen to the small business people who are crying out for guaranteed health care. Listen to the farmer from Kansas who said: "I cannot afford to pay increasingly higher premiums to cover the ones who have no insurance and no ability to pay for their health care."

Listen to the head of a small manufacturing company in Massachusetts, who said that under today's system, if one of her workers was struck by serious illness, "our group rates would soar, and I would have to make the decision of closing my business of letting employees play Russian roulette with their families and savings."

There are not voices of political friction—they are voices of reason.

So let us stand up for small business. Let us do what they need and not what the special interests want.

And let us pass the guaranteed, affordable health care that our economy deserves, and our small businesses demand.

A-Z, A CHANCE TO SHOW AMERICA WE MEAN BUSINESS ABOUT CUTTING

(Mr. HORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, if we legislators have learned one thing since the 1992 elections, it is that deficit reduction is the top priority for the American people. Hundreds of letters and telephone calls from constituents tell us one thing:

Americans know that our Nation's survival rests upon cutting excess Federal spending. But for too long the American people have not seen much paring down of these Federal costs. They have heard a lot of talk about it, and it has been discussed at length in these Chambers. But the American people are still waiting for something to be done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the A-Z spending cuts plan Congress has a chance to show America that we finally mean business about cutting. There are many of us in this House who really mean it when we say we want to cut the deficit. The A-Z plan gives us a chance to put our names on the line, and for those who have hidden so long behind the secrecy of House committees, they will be forced to come out in the open and be held accountable for their deeds.

The American people deserve no less than forthright guarantees from us that, when it comes to decisions about cutting the deficit, we will act with the

deficit and sound common sense in mind. All Americans deserve to know who is loyal to them and who is loyal to the powerful committee chairmen.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 3266, the A-Z spending cuts plan, and I urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition that will bring it before us.

WAL-MART—A DISCOUNT STORE MARKING UP OUR HEALTH INSURANCE

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, when you and I go into Wal-Mart, we are looking for markdowns. But I ask, "How would you feel knowing, when you walk in, you're getting a markup of 30 percent on our health insurance because of the way that a company like Wal-Mart does business?"

Mr. Speaker, this is one of our largest private employers, but yet, out of its half-million employees, leaves almost 250,000 without health insurance. What that means, according to one group, is that \$480 million of Wal-Mart's health care costs get shifted to the rest of us who are able to have health insurance.

And how does that affect us? It is because 30 percent of every insurance premium in this country which my colleagues and I pay goes to pay for those who do not have health care. The 85 percent who are uninsured in this country are working at institutions like Wal-Mart. For those who are insured at Wal-Mart there is a high out-of-pocket cost which is hard for those making \$6 and \$7 an hour, and yet Wal-Mart disavows the Clinton health plan that would lower Wal-Mart's health care costs and its employees' health care costs while providing comprehensive guaranteed private insurance for all.

So, Mr. Speaker, I challenge Wal-Mart to help Wal-Mart workers and Wal-Mart consumers for a health plan, to support a health plan, that has lower costs, that does not shift the costs to us consumers, and that is the best way to truly have a discount store offer discounts without marking up our health insurance.

WHAT WE SHOULD DO ABOUT HAITI

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with the utmost gravity that I must sound a warning to my colleagues: The Clinton administration is actively considering the unilateral invasion of Haiti.

Certainly it is true that the administration's Haitian policy has been a total failure and has, predictably, brought great additional suffering to the Haitian people. We were told last December when the United Nations imposed an oil embargo on Haiti, sought by the United States, that the de facto regime in Haiti would be bought to their knees by the middle of January. Four months later the regime and the Haitian military are not worse off than they were last January. In fact, they are profiteering from the sale of gasoline at \$10 per gallon. The new proposals for a stepped-up embargo will not work any better than the current ones because the border between Haiti and the Dominican Republic is a sieve; oil and goods continue to flow unimpeded from the Dominican Republic to Haiti. The suffering of the Haitian people and the level of violence that is inflicted upon them have only been increased by the embargo and by failures in United States foreign policy.

These failures and, speaking frankly, domestic pressure and the concern about advancing a congressional agenda, now are strengthening the hand of invasion advocates within the administration. They argue for a unilateral invasion and the restoration of President Aristide to power, to take place after the inevitable failure of the increased sanctions now being proposed.

Mr. Speaker, invading Haiti would be a terrible mistake. The administration reportedly is considering a plan that will commit American troops, but does not have a clearly defined military mission for them or a plan for extricating them. The protection duties and civil strife caused by returning Aristide, and resentment against American policy, would keep American troops there for years—and cost us tens of billions of dollars. We should all remember that the last time American troops invaded Haiti, the marines stayed there for 19 years. Yes, 19 years, and the end result was the Duvalier regime. President Clinton and the Congress must weigh the cost of American lives and resources if the United States, by unilateral invasion, assumes the responsibility for restoring peace, governance, and economic stability to Haiti.

What should the administration do? It should seek out the pragmatic individuals who do exist in Haiti in a serious effort to find a consensus for solutions to the current political crisis in Haiti. This search for solutions must not be hampered by a stubborn insistence that President Aristide be returned to office. That stance is a recipe for disaster.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that before the United States seriously considers an invasion of Haiti, by whatever means or whatever name, we must examine all the options and insure that we have legitimate geopolitical and strategic interests at

stake that justify the use of unilateral force and possible loss of American lives. Those interests and an extrication plan have not been clearly defined by the administration; nor has it exhausted all nonviolent options at its disposal. Mr. Speaker, an invasion would be a serious mistake which risks American lives, resources, and leadership prestige, at a time when the reputation of American foreign policy leadership could scarcely be lower.

VOTE FOR THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN ACT WITH A CLEAR CONSCIENCE

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, for all the talk about the second amendment, you would think people would talk about the whole amendment. There are people who say it is wrong to take assault weapons out of the hands of the gangs and the druglords because "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." But they forget that the amendment protects the right because "A well regulated Militia" is "necessary to the security of a free State. * * *

Show me the well regulated militia carrying street sweepers. Show me the well regulated militia carrying AK-47's and TEC 9's. There are none.

When we speak of assault weapons, let us not forget who these guns are assaulting. When we talk about street sweepers, we are not talking about people who clean up the litter on our streets, but rather about a gun designed to litter the streets with bodies.

Where are these guns? They are on the streets of our cities, murdering our children. Street thugs are not my idea of a well regulated militia, Mr. Speaker, and it is not yours either, you can vote for this bill with a clear conscience.

IT'S TAX FREEDOM DAY, BUT OUR CITIZENS ARE STILL PAYING FOR GOVERNMENT

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today is Tax Freedom Day, and all the days since January 1 until now Americans have been working just to pay Federal, State and local taxes. But if our citizens think that they can start working for themselves tomorrow, they can forget it because between now and July 13, which is Government Freedom Day, our citizens will be working to pay for the cost of Government regulations and unfunded Federal mandates.

In 1913 Tax Freedom Day was January 30.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, our citizens all across the country are demanding that we begin a march back to those halcyon days, and we will start that process today with the A-to-Z proposal. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to sign the discharge petition so we can debate this issue. I am sure that all Americans will applaud us for it.

NATIONAL TOURISM WEEK

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, from the Lowcountry to the Upstate, from the Midlands to the Pee Dee, South Carolina is a State abundant in natural beauty and historical significance.

It is no wonder, then, that thousands of tourists each year consider South Carolina the ideal destination for vacation, for recreation and for historical education.

Tourists visiting the State of South Carolina spend billions of dollars each year, which in turn generate millions of dollars in tax revenue and create thousands of jobs.

In fact, according to the most recent data available, travel and tourism was the second largest industry in South Carolina in 1991.

In that same year, tourists spent over \$13 million a day in the State, and South Carolina was ranked 23d in the United States in terms of total tax revenue generated by travel and tourism.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate National Tourism Week, and as we go about our legislative affairs, let us keep in mind the impact our decisions could have on the travel and tourism industry nationwide, and in States like South Carolina, that have come to increasingly rely on the tourism industry in the face of changing State economies.

TAX FREEDOM DAY

(Mr. ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, with April 15 safely behind us, most Americans have no interest in discussing taxes. But this week, we will all get one more reminder of how stiff the tax burden is.

This Thursday, May 5, is Tax Freedom Day. Tax Freedom Day is the day to which the average American must now work to pay the combined Federal, State, and local tax bill.

Tax Freedom Day is now later in the year than it has ever been. Last year it was May 3, but due in large measure to the Clinton tax hike, it has moved to May 5.

This means the average American works the first 125 days of the year for Uncle Sam. Only on May 6, do America's families begin working for themselves.

All of this is one more reason to cut back the size of Government. We should start with the A-to-Z spending cut plan.

MEMBERS ENCOURAGED TO SUPPORT ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the average American does not own an assault weapon, and yet every American can be a victim of assault weapons. Think about the innocent diners in the cafeteria not long ago where the gentleman walked in and rubbed out so many of them. And when you look at what they hide behind as their right to own an assault weapon, it is an amendment saying they have a right to bear arms, and they would then say that means grenades, rocket launchers, or anything they want. We all know that is really going very far to the extreme.

Very soon this body is going to take up a bill that starts to get some control over this. No other democratic nation allows these types of things. These are military weapons with only one purpose—to wipe out as many people as possible and as fast as possible, and they have no sporting purpose. You cannot possibly think of any animal you could hit with these weapons and have anything of the animal left. So I think it is time for all of us as Americans to join hands and speak up as we get ready to vote on this and make sure we have the votes to finally ban assault weapons.

Mr. Speaker, this hunt for votes is getting very serious. The vote is very tight, and we need every single Member joining us.

EXCESSIVE BONUS PAYMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY PERSONNEL UNFAIR TO TAXPAYERS, SENIOR CITIZENS

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Social Security Task Force, which was set up to watch over Social Security and protect our senior citizens, I want to tell the Members how outraged I am that the Social Security Administration paid \$32 million in bonuses last year, with one bonus of \$9,256 to a person who was on the job only 2½ months. He got more in bonuses than most Social Security recipients receive in a year.

Last year Social Security asked for and received from this Congress an ad-

ditional \$200 million to pay for benefits to Social Security recipients. We now know that millions of these dollars went right into bonuses. This is not fair to our senior citizens. This is not fair to the taxpayers. The Social Security agency is the same entity that seniors tell me does not even answer their tollfree hot line.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to Social Security, I say that Social Security money must be used for Social Security purposes only. And no more bonuses, especially as long as we have these lingering problems in the Social Security agency.

SUPPORT FOR CLINTON HEALTH PLAN FOUND WANTING

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader just spoke and said that small business wants health care and that it does not have to be expensive. He is exactly right on that issue.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Clinton health plan in the Committee on Ways and Means received zero votes from any Republican or Democrat. And why? First of all, Republicans and Democrats realize that we do not need giant health care alliances that give the Democratic Party power over our lives and increases the size of the Federal Government.

Second, we know that 80 percent of the American public likes their health care plans, but they also realize that the key words are that there needs to be some changes, but not doing away with the system itself. We do not need alliances that control our lives, we do not need employer mandates, and those small business people who came to see me after seeing the President still have a lot of concerns about jobs being lost, with higher taxes, alliances and mandates.

And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that there are no assault weapons in this assault weapons ban. They are not assault weapons. They have never been used by any military except for the M-1 gran. You can take a stock for my shotgun and put a corner on it, and it will become an assault weapon.

THE A-TO-Z PLAN PROMISES CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for accountability in Congress.

The A-to-Z spending cut program will hold Members of Congress accountable for specific cuts in the budget, cuts

that are needed to bring our deficit down and eliminate all the bureaucratic redtape that is clogging our Government.

My colleagues, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS], are right on track. The A-to-Z program will allow Members to have a plain-and-simple vote, up or down, on real cuts.

There will be no more excuses like "We'll make those cuts the next time," or "We have to wait to do health care."

As my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], pointed out during the budget resolution debate, first the administration wants more specific cuts, then it complains that the cuts are not specific enough.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot be any more specific than with the A-to-Z plan. I call on all my colleagues to bring responsibility back to this House and sign the discharge petition for A-to-Z.

MILITARY ACTION IN HAITI SEEN AS UNWISE

(Mr. COX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is moving the United States perilously close to military intervention in Haiti. Yesterday the Washington Post reported that President Clinton is considering a plan to send armed military trainers to Haiti. Yet the end result of military intervention in Haiti is unclear.

Will we invade and supplant the current control group with military force? Whom will we install? Aristide? He has proven totally unable to facilitate his own return. He has been unwilling to compromise, and his recent attacks on the United States have vilified the very people who are trying their best to help Haiti.

If President Clinton plans to invade Haiti, he will make an enormous mistake in the United States military force posture, and if he does not do so in the end, his current promises will hold out false hopes for the long-suffering people of that island nation.

□ 1510

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT'S 1995 BUDGET REQUEST—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WISE) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, I am transmitting the District of Columbia Government's 1995 budget request and 1994 revised budget request.

The District of Columbia Government has submitted a 1995 budget request for \$3,409 million in 1995 that includes a Federal payment of \$674 million, the amount authorized and requested by the Mayor and the City Council. The 1995 Federal payment level proposed in my fiscal year 1995 budget of \$670 million is also included in the District's 1995 budget as an alternative level. My transmittal of the District's budget, as required by law, does not represent an endorsement of its contents.

I look forward to working with the Congress throughout the 1995 appropriations process.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 4, 1994.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MEEK). Pursuant to House Resolution 414 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3254.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3254) to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, with Mr. WISE, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 3, 1994, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by titles as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and each title is considered as read.

The clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1994".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The clerk will designate section 2.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "debt-for-science exchange" means an agreement whereby a portion of a nation's commercial external debt burden is exchanged by the holder for a contribution of local currencies or other assets to support scientific and technological research;

(2) the term "Director" means the Director of the Foundation;

(3) the term "Foundation" means the National Science Foundation;

(4) the term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given such term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965;

(5) the term "national research facility" means a research facility funded by the Foundation which is available, subject to appropriate policies allocating access, for use by all scientists and engineers affiliated with research institutions located in the United States;

(6) the term "science-technology center" has the meaning given such term in section 231(f) of the Excellence in Mathematics, Science, and Engineering Education Act of 1990, and shall include both newly organized and established science-technology centers; and

(7) the term "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

TITLE I—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that the programs of the Foundation are important for the Nation to strengthen basic research and develop human resources in science and engineering, and that those programs should be funded at an adequate level.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 1995.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$3,200,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, which shall be available for the following categories:

(A) Research and Related Activities, \$2,275,500,000, which shall be available for the following subcategories:

(i) Biological Sciences, \$301,800,000.

(ii) Computer and Information Science and Engineering, \$262,200,000.

(iii) Engineering, \$313,400,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall be expended for primary materials processing research.

(iv) Geosciences, \$425,000,000.

(v) Mathematical and Physical Sciences, \$641,200,000.

(vi) Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, \$106,500,000.

(vii) United States Polar Research Programs, \$160,800,000.

(viii) United States Antarctic Logistical Activities, \$62,600,000.

(ix) Critical Technologies Institute, \$2,000,000.

(B) Education and Human Resources, \$569,600,000.

(C) Academic Research Facilities Modernization Program, \$150,000,000.

(D) Major Research Equipment, \$70,000,000.

(E) Salaries and Expenses, \$125,500,000.

(F) Office of Inspector General, \$4,200,000.

(G) Headquarters Relocation, \$5,200,000.

(2) Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1)(A) and (B)—

(A) \$35,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992;

(B) \$30,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 305 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991;

(C) \$45,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 307 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991; and

(D) \$16,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 309 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991.

(c) FISCAL YEAR 1996.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$3,392,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, which shall be available for the following categories:

(A) Research and Related Activities, \$2,397,500,000, which shall be available for the following subcategories:

(i) Biological Sciences, \$316,800,000.

(ii) Computer and Information Science and Engineering, \$285,000,000.

(iii) Engineering, \$338,000,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall be expended for primary materials processing research.

(iv) Geosciences, \$444,000,000.

(v) Mathematical and Physical Sciences, \$668,800,000.

(vi) Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, \$116,100,000.

(vii) United States Polar Research Programs, \$164,800,000.

(viii) United States Antarctic Logistical Activities, \$64,000,000.

(B) Education and Human Resources, \$586,000,000.

(C) Academic Research Facilities Modernization Program, \$200,000,000.

(D) Major Research Equipment, \$67,000,000.

(E) Salaries and Expenses, \$132,000,000.

(F) Office of Inspector General, \$4,300,000.

(G) Headquarters Relocation, \$5,200,000.

(2) Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1)(A) and (B)—

(A) \$35,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by the Scientific Advanced-Technology Act of 1992;

(B) \$50,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 305 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991;

(C) \$60,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 307 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991; and

(D) \$22,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 309 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991.

(3) No funds shall be expended for fiscal year 1996 for the Critical Technologies Institute.

(d) MEETING FUNDING GOALS.—In allocating funds authorized under subsections (b)(1)(A) and (c)(1)(A), the Foundation shall give priority to meeting the funding goals established for the Foundation for Presidential research initiatives by the Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology, or any successor entity which assumes its responsibilities.

(e) EDUCATION SUPPORT FOR UNDER-REPRESENTED GROUPS.—In allocating funds authorized under subsections (b)(1)(B) and (c)(1)(B), the Foundation shall support education activities to encourage the participation of women, minorities who are underrepresented in science, engineering, and mathematics, and persons with disabilities, and shall coordinate such activities with related efforts of other Federal agencies.

SEC. 102. PROPORTIONAL REDUCTION OF RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES AMOUNTS.

If the amount appropriated pursuant to section 101(b)(1)(A) or (c)(1)(A) is less than the amount authorized under that subparagraph, the amount authorized for each subcategory under that subparagraph shall be reduced by the same proportion.

SEC. 103. CONSULTATION AND REPRESENTATION EXPENSES.

From appropriations made under authorizations provided in this Act, not more than \$10,000 may be used in each fiscal year for official consultation, representation, or other extraordinary expenses at the discretion of the Director. The

determination of the Director shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

SEC. 104. TRANSFER OF FUNDS.

For any given fiscal year, the Director may propose transfers to or from any category described in section 101 up to a maximum of 10 percent of the amount authorized for that category. An explanation of any such proposed transfer must be transmitted in writing to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Labor and Human Resources and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate. The proposed transfer may be made only after 30 calendar days have passed after transmission of such written explanation.

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. ANNUAL REPORT.

Section 3 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1862) is amended by striking subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Foundation shall provide an annual report to the President which shall be submitted by the Director to the Congress at the time of the President's annual budget submission. The report shall—

"(1) contain a strategic plan which—
 "(A) defines for a three-year period the overall goals for the Foundation and specific goals for each major activity of the Foundation, including each scientific directorate, the education directorate, and the polar programs office; and
 "(B) describes how the identified goals relate to national needs and will exploit new opportunities in science and technology;

"(2) identify the criteria and describe the procedures which the Foundation will use to assess progress toward achieving the goals identified in accordance with paragraph (1);
 "(3) review the activities of the Foundation during the preceding year which have contributed toward achievement of goals identified in accordance with paragraph (1) and summarize planned activities for the coming three years in the context of the identified goals, with particular emphasis on the Foundation's planned contributions to major multi-agency research and education initiatives;

"(4) contain such recommendations as the Foundation considers appropriate; and
 "(5) include information on the acquisition and disposition by the Foundation of any patents and patent rights."

SEC. 202. NATIONAL RESEARCH FACILITIES.

(a) **FACILITIES PLAN.**—The Director shall provide to Congress annually, at the time of the President's budget submission, a plan for construction of, and repair and upgrades to, national research facilities. The plan shall include estimates of the cost for such construction, repairs, and upgrades, and estimates of the cost for the operation and maintenance of existing and proposed new facilities. For proposed new construction and for major upgrades to existing facilities, the plan shall include funding profiles by fiscal year and milestones for major phases of the construction. The plan shall include cost estimates in the categories of construction, repair, and upgrades for the year in which the plan is submitted to Congress and for not fewer than the succeeding 4 years.

(b) **LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.**—No funds appropriated for any project which involves construction of new national research facilities or construction necessary for upgrading the capabilities of existing national research facilities shall be obligated unless the funds are specifically authorized for such purpose by this Act or any other Act which is not an appropriations Act, or unless the total

estimated cost to the Foundation of the construction project is less than \$50,000,000. This subsection shall not apply to construction projects approved by the National Science Board prior to June 30, 1993.

SEC. 203. ELIGIBILITY FOR RESEARCH FACILITY AWARDS.

Section 203(b) of the Academic Research Facilities Modernization Act of 1988 is amended by striking the final sentence of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Director shall give priority to institutions or consortia that have not received such funds in the preceding 5 years, except that this sentence shall not apply to previous funding received for the same multiyear project. The Director shall exclude from consideration for awards to be made under the Program after fiscal year 1995 any institutions or consortia which received funds, appropriated for a fiscal year after fiscal year 1994, for the repair, renovation, construction, or replacement of academic facilities, from any Federal funding source for projects that were not subjected to a competitive, merit-based award process."

SEC. 204. ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPATION IN INFORMAL SCIENCE EDUCATION ACTIVITIES.

No science-technology center shall be disqualified from competing for funding support under the informal science education programs included within the Education and Human Resources activities of the Foundation on the basis of the geographic location of the center, the size of the population served by the center, or the date on which the center commences operation.

SEC. 205. SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT AMENDMENTS.

The Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by amending section 32 to read as follows:

"FINDINGS AND POLICY"

"SEC. 32. The national security and economic competitiveness of the United States demand the full development and use of the engineering, mathematical, and scientific talents and skills of all its citizens. Past discrimination, cultural barriers, unequal educational opportunities, and other factors discourage women, minorities, and persons with disabilities from studying and working in engineering, mathematics, and science. The Congress declares it is the policy of the United States to encourage the participation in engineering, mathematics, and science of members of the groups that are underrepresented."

(2) in section 33—

(A) by amending the section head to read as follows:

"EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IN SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING";

(B) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking "women" and inserting in lieu thereof "women, minorities who are underrepresented in science, engineering, and mathematics, and persons with disabilities (collectively referred to in this section as 'members of underrepresented groups')";

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking "female students and to increase female student awareness" and inserting in lieu thereof "students who are members of underrepresented groups and to make those students aware";

(D) in paragraph (4), by striking "research";

(E) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"(5) support programs under which scientists and engineers who are members of underrepresented groups interact with elementary, secondary, and undergraduate students";

(F) in paragraph (8), by striking "to be known as the National Research Opportunity Grants, to women scientists and engineers" and inserting in lieu thereof "to scientists and engineers who are members of underrepresented groups";

(G) in paragraph (9), by striking "such women" and inserting in lieu thereof "such persons";

(H) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (10);

(I) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and";

(J) by adding at the end the following:

"(12) support efforts to initiate and expand research opportunities at institutions serving members of underrepresented groups.

"(b) In carrying out activities under this section, the Foundation may conduct or support activities in which participation is limited to members of one or more underrepresented groups."

(K) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 33."; and

(L) except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, by striking "women" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "members of underrepresented groups";

(3) by striking section 34;

(4) in section 36(a), by inserting "persons with disabilities" after "minorities";

(5) in section 36(b), by striking the second sentence and inserting in lieu the following: "The Chairpersons of relevant committees or subcommittees of the National Science Board, as designated by the Chairperson of the Board, shall be ex officio members of the Committee.";

(6) in section 36 by striking subsections (c) and (d) and redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively;

(7) in section 36 by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) The Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and evaluating all Foundation matters relating to participation in, opportunities for, and advancement in education, training, and research in science and engineering of members of underrepresented groups."; and

(8) in section 36(d), as redesignated by paragraph (6) of this section, by striking "additional".

SEC. 206. ROLE OF THE FOUNDATION IN ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS.

The Foundation's efforts to improve the economic competitiveness of the United States shall be in accord with the functions of the Foundation as specified by section 3 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. The primary mission of the Foundation continues to be the support of basic scientific research and science education and the support of research fundamental to the engineering process and engineering education.

SEC. 207. ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS.

(a) **NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950 AMENDMENTS.**—The National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) in section 4(e) (42 U.S.C. 1863(e)) by striking the second and third sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Board shall adopt procedures governing the conduct of its meetings, including definition of a quorum and delivery of notice of meetings to members of the Board.";

(2) in section 5(e) (42 U.S.C. 1864(e)) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) Any delegation of authority or imposition of conditions under paragraph (1) shall be promptly published in the Federal Register and reported to the Committees on Labor and Human Resources and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.";

(3) in section 14 (42 U.S.C. 1873) by striking subsection (j); and

(4) in section 15(a) (42 U.S.C. 1874(a)) by striking "Atomic Energy Commission" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary of Energy".

(b) **NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1988 AMENDMENTS.**—Section

117(a)(1)(B)(v) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1988 is amended to read as follows:

"(v) from schools established outside the several States and the District of Columbia by any agency of the Federal Government for dependents of its employees."

(c) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1977 AMENDMENT.—Section 8 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, 1977, is repealed.

SEC. 208. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTATION AND FACILITIES.

The Foundation shall incorporate the guidelines set forth in Important Notice No. 91, dated March 11, 1983 (48 Fed. Reg. 15754, April 12, 1983) relating to the use and operation of Foundation-supported research instrumentation and facilities, in its notice of Grant General Conditions, and shall examine more closely the adherence of grantee organizations to such guidelines.

SEC. 209. ENVIRONMENTALLY ADVANCED EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Improving the general understanding of the relationships between economic and technical activities and the environment, and the opportunities for improvements in such relations, is essential for the effective realization of sustainable economic development.

(2) In post-secondary education, with the exception of environmental specialists, environmental considerations are typically not integrated into the required coursework for technical, engineering, science, and related professions.

(3) The integration of environmental considerations into all technical, engineering, science, and related professions in a timely fashion is essential to better achieving sustainable economic development.

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish a program to promote the development and distribution of curriculum and materials—

(1) at the primary and secondary levels that will improve the understanding of the relationships between economic and technical activities and the environment and the opportunities for improving those relationships; and

(2) at the post-secondary level that will incorporate the principles and practices of environmental soundness and total cost accounting into all technical, engineering, design, scientific, and related disciplines.

(c) TECHNICAL PROGRAMS.—(1) The Director shall ensure that the special needs of technical programs of institutions described in paragraph (2) are addressed in executing this section, including disseminating information about practices that exemplify environmentally sound practices.

(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), institutions referred to in paragraph (1) are institutions of higher education (as determined under section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a))) that offer a 2-year associate-degree program, 2-year certificate program, or other shorter program described in such section 1201(a).

(B) Notwithstanding section 1201(a)(4) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, institutions referred to in paragraph (1) may include proprietary institutions.

(d) COORDINATION.—The Director shall consult with the heads of other agencies of the Federal Government, State and local governments, educational institutions, and appropriate private sector organizations, including accreditation boards for engineering, technology, and design educational institutions in executing this section.

SEC. 210. LIMITATION ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no funds are authorized to be appropriated

for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1996 for carrying out the programs and activities for which funds are authorized by this Act, or the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 211. INDIRECT COST REIMBURSEMENT.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized under section 101(b) may be awarded to any grantee who reported Federal research grant outlays in excess of \$10,000,000 in fiscal year 1994, unless such grantee—

(1) agrees to notify the Foundation of the amount of any increased indirect expense; and

(2) agrees to the permanent cancellation, in an amount that equals the increased indirect expense, of its claims for the portion of unliquidated obligations from prior year research grants that comprise the indirect expense allocated to the Foundation.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "increased indirect expense" means the amount by which the grantee's claim for indirect expense allocated to the Foundation for research grants for fiscal year 1995 exceeds the amount of such claim for fiscal year 1994.

SEC. 212. AWARD OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS: REQUIREMENT OF COMPETITION.

(a) The Director may not make a grant or award a contract to any institutions or consortia for the performance of research and development, or for the construction of any research or other facility, unless such grant or award is made using a competitive, merit-based evaluation process.

(b)(1) A provision of law may not be construed as modifying or superseding the provisions of subsection (a), or as requiring funds to be made available by the Director to a particular institution or consortium by grant or contract, unless that provision of law—

(A) specifically refers to this section;

(B) specifically states that such provision of law modifies or supersedes the provisions of this section; and

(C) specifically identifies the particular institution or consortium involved and states that the grant to be made or the contract to be awarded, as the case may be, pursuant to such provision of law, is being made or awarded in contravention to subsection (a).

(2) A grant may not be made, or a contract awarded, pursuant to a provision of law that authorizes or requires the making of the grant, or the awarding of the contract, in a manner that is inconsistent with subsection (a) until—

(A) the Director submits to Congress a notice in writing of the intent to make the grant or award the contract; and

(B) a period of 180 days has elapsed after the date on which the notice is received by Congress.

TITLE III—ACADEMIC RESEARCH FACILITIES MODERNIZATION

SEC. 301. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the deficiencies in the condition of buildings and equipment used for the conduct of fundamental research and related education programs at many universities and colleges which are cited in section 202 of the Academic Research Facilities Modernization Act of 1988 are substantially unchanged;

(2) a national effort, involving the participation of Federal and State governments and the private sector, is required to make progress in improving the state of academic research facilities; and

(3) because of the scale of the problem, the Federal effort to upgrade academic research facilities must involve a coordinated program among all Federal agencies which sponsor research at academic institutions.

SEC. 302. FACILITIES MODERNIZATION PLAN.

The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, through the Federal Coordi-

nating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology, or any successor entity which assumes its responsibilities, shall develop a plan for a multiagency Federal program to provide financial support to institutions of higher education for the repair, renovation, or replacement of obsolete science and engineering facilities primarily devoted to research. The plan shall—

(1) include participation by all Federal departments and agencies which provide substantial Federal support for research and development activities at institutions of higher education;

(2) provide estimates of the level of funding required, by department and agency, and period for which funding should be provided to relieve substantially the backlog of research facilities needs and to ensure that, at the conclusion of the period proposed, the facilities available will be satisfactory to support national research needs;

(3) take into consideration, for determining the requirements of paragraph (2), ongoing efforts by Federal departments and agencies, State governments, and the private sector to upgrade research facilities;

(4) be designed to address the needs of the categories of institutions eligible for awards under the Academic Research Facilities Modernization Act of 1988;

(5) detail administrative procedures and guidelines for the implementation of the modernization program; and

(6) state procedures and data collection steps which have been implemented to assess the state of academic research facilities and to measure the rate of progress in improving the condition of the facilities.

Within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall transmit to the Congress the plan developed under this section.

SEC. 303. LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.

No funds appropriated to the Foundation for construction of new facilities or construction necessary for upgrading the capabilities of existing facilities at institutions eligible for awards under the Academic Research Facilities Modernization Act of 1988 shall be obligated unless the funds are awarded in accordance with the requirements of the Academic Research Facilities Modernization Act of 1988 or are specifically authorized for such purpose by this Act or any other Act which is not an appropriations Act.

TITLE IV—INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

SEC. 401. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Debt-for-science exchanges can provide an innovative means to enhance scientific cooperation with countries whose external debt burden prevents them from allocating sufficient resources to their scientific and technological infrastructures.

(2) Debt-for-science exchanges have been demonstrated to improve the state of scientific research and education in several countries, including Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Chile, and Mexico.

SEC. 402. DEBT-FOR-SCIENCE EXCHANGES.

(a) DEBT-FOR-SCIENCE EXCHANGE GRANTS.—The Director is authorized to make grants to organizations within the United States, including colleges and universities, for the purpose of debt-for-science exchanges. Before making any grant under this section, the Director shall ascertain that—

(1) funds resulting from the debt-for-science exchange will be expended only for purposes of international cooperative scientific research and development projects;

(2) the debt-for-science exchange will make funds available for such projects which otherwise would not be available;

(3) the amount of local currency provided as a result of the debt-for-science exchange will be substantially greater than the United States dollar purchase price of the debt;

(4) the grantee certifies that the debtor government has accepted the terms of the exchange and that an agreement has been reached to cancel the commercial debt; and

(5) Federal grants made under this section will be equally matched by non-Federal contributions to purchase debt.

(b) **INVESTMENT OF GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE.**—Grantees or subgrantees of funds provided under this section may retain, without deposit in the Treasury of the United States and without further appropriation by Congress, interest earned on the proceeds of any resulting debt-for-science exchange pending disbursements of such proceeds and interest for approved program purposes, which may include the establishment of an endowment, the income of which is used for such purposes.

(c) **COORDINATION.**—In carrying out subsection (a) the Director shall coordinate with Federal agencies, such as the Agency for International Development, that have expertise in debt exchanges.

SEC. 403. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION PARTICIPATION IN BINATIONAL AND MULTINATIONAL ENDOWED SCIENCE FOUNDATIONS.

The Director, in consultation with appropriate officials of the United States and foreign countries, may encourage and facilitate the establishment of binational and multinational endowed science foundations, and may participate in the operation and governance of such foundations, including serving as a member of or designating members to the Boards of Governors, if such foundations—

(1) have Boards of Governors whose members are chosen to represent participating countries and possess expertise in international scientific cooperation;

(2) have a structure and operational characteristics determined exclusively by their Boards of Governors, consistent with paragraph (3); and

(3) are established and governed in accordance with charters which include provisions—

(A) to ensure that the funding of the endowment is shared equitably among the participating nations, appropriate to their economic resources;

(B) to protect the endowment's principal from loss of value due to inflation;

(C) to define the range of scientific and educational activities to be funded;

(D) to define criteria for application, merit review, and awarding of funds which encompass, at a minimum, consideration of scientific merit, strength of collaborative arrangements, and potential benefit to participants;

(E) to limit administrative costs to those that are prudent and necessary; and

(F) to engage an independent auditor to perform an annual organization-wide audit of such foundations, in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and to make the results of the audit immediately available to the Director and the Board of Governors.

SEC. 404. REPORT.

Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the Congress a strategic plan for international scientific cooperation activities undertaken by the Foundation which—

(1) describes and evaluates all activities involving international scientific cooperation currently carried out by the Foundation;

(2) describes how these activities relate to ongoing and prospective Foundation research and educational activities;

(3) details research activities and geographic areas where international scientific cooperation

has been most effective and where it has been least effective;

(4) describes plans for future cooperative international scientific projects; and

(5) assesses the research activities and geographic areas where future international scientific cooperation would be most effective.

TITLE V—UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

SEC. 501. REQUIREMENT FOR FUNDING.

Each educational institution that receives a research grant from the Foundation in fiscal year 1995 shall, as a condition of receiving such grant, provide to the Foundation the following information on its undergraduate mathematics, science, and engineering activities:

(1) A description of teacher training programs mandated by the institution for teaching assistants, including the number of training hours required.

(2) The institution's policy regarding the relative importance of teaching and research duties in decisions on promotion, tenure, and salary for faculty, including any written policy with specific criteria.

(3) Any policy allowing faculty to replace university salary with funds from outside sources, along with any policy allowing faculty to replace all or part of the teaching load with increased research.

(4) The number of faculty released from some or all of their teaching responsibilities pursuant to a policy described in paragraph (3), with the number replacing all or some of their salary with Federal funds reported separately.

(5) The number and percentage of faculty, not including those on regular sabbatical leave, teaching no undergraduate courses.

(6) The number and percentage of faculty supported by active Federal research grants teaching freshman or sophomore lecture courses.

(7) The number and percentage of lecture sources taught by individuals other than faculty.

(8) The number of students per course in each introductory course.

Information shall be provided for the most recent academic year for which it is available. For purposes of this section, the term "educational institution" means an institution of higher education that is ranked among the top 100 of the institutions receiving Federal research and development funding, as documented in the latest annual report of the Foundation entitled "Federal Support to Universities, Colleges, and Selected Non-Profit Institutions". The term "faculty" means tenured or tenure-track employees not serving in full-time administrative positions. The Foundation shall compile this information and submit it to the Congress no later than December 31, 1995.

SEC. 502. RECOMMENDATIONS.

The Director shall transmit to the Congress, at the time of the President's budget request for fiscal year 1997, recommendations as to how Foundation research funds could be used to increase the focus on undergraduate education at institutions of higher education.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT
Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHLERT:
Page 3, line 15 through page 7, line 8, amend subsections (b) and (c) to read as follows:

(b) **FISCAL YEAR 1995.**—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$3,150,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, which

shall be available for the following categories:

(A) Research and Related Activities, \$2,254,800,000, which shall be available for the following categories:

(i) Biological Sciences, \$298,800,000.

(ii) Computer and Information Science and Engineering, \$260,600,000.

(iii) Engineering, \$311,500,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall be expended for primary materials processing research.

(iv) Geosciences, \$421,300,000.

(v) Mathematical and Physical Sciences, \$636,300,000.

(vi) Social, Behavioral, and Economic Science, \$104,800,000.

(vii) United States Polar Research Programs, \$158,800,000.

(viii) United States Antarctic Logistical Activities, \$62,600,000.

(B) Education and Human Resources, \$586,000,000.

(C) Academic Research Facilities Modernization Program, \$110,000,000.

(D) Major Research Equipment, \$70,000,000.

(E) Salaries and Expenses, \$120,000,000.

(F) Office of Inspector General, \$4,000,000.

(G) Headquarters Relocation, \$5,200,000.

(2) Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)(A) and (B)—

(A) \$35,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by the Scientific and Advanced Technology Act of 1992.

(B) \$30,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 305 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991;

(C) \$45,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 307 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991; and

(D) \$16,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 309 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991.

(3) No funds shall be expended for fiscal year 1995 for the Critical Technologies Institute.

(c) **FISCAL YEAR 1996.**—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation \$3,234,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, which shall be available for the following categories:

(A) Research and Related Activities, \$2,299,800,000, which shall be available for the following subcategories:

(i) Biological Sciences, \$304,100,000.

(ii) Computer and Information Science and Engineering, \$273,600,000.

(iii) Engineering, \$324,500,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall be expended for primary materials processing research.

(iv) Geosciences, \$426,200,000.

(v) Mathematical and Physical Sciences, \$640,100,000.

(vi) Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences, \$110,500,000.

(vii) United States Polar Research Programs, \$158,200,000.

(viii) United States Antarctic Logistical Activities, \$62,600,000.

(B) Education and Human Resources, \$586,000,000.

(C) Academic Research Facilities Modernization Program, \$150,000,000.

(D) Major Research Equipment, \$67,000,000.

(E) Salaries and Expenses, \$122,000,000.

(F) Office of Inspector General, \$4,000,000.

(G) Headquarters Relocation, \$5,200,000.

(2) Of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1)(A) and (B)—

(A) \$35,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by the Scientific Advanced Technology Act of 1992;

(B) \$50,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 305 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991;

(C) \$60,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 307 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991; and

(D) \$22,000,000 are authorized for activities authorized by section 309 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991.

(3) No funds shall be expended for fiscal year 1996 for the Critical Technologies Institute.

Mr. BOEHLERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, as I stated in yesterday's debate, I have no quarrel with the basic thrust of this bill; indeed, I heartily endorse its fundamental principles. But I do have a problem with the authorization levels in this bill, which are utterly unrealistic—indeed, they represent a denial of reality.

These authorization debates we have, have come to remind me of nothing so much as the children's program "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood." It is as if, at the beginning of authorization discussions, we take off our coats and shoes, put on our cardigans and slippers, affect our mildest expressions and most benign tones, and pretend that we can be nice to everybody in our neighborhood—which is to say everyone in the entire Nation. We sing soothing songs of plenty for our hour of fantasy, and then we let the appropriators bring the disharmony of reality into the world.

This is, to speak frankly, a screwy way to set priorities. The authorization ought to reflect the same budget realities under which the rest of Congress has to labor. And this bill does not.

We are dealing with an agency that has seen its budget more than double—that's right, double—since 1986, and the bill is proposing 6 percent growth in each of the next 2 years at the time of a discretionary budget freeze. Does this sound realistic, even for an agency as valued and esteemed as the NSF? I do not think so.

But you do not have to take my word for it. The figures in my amendment were not derived from some personal whim or random thought. The fiscal year 1995 authorization in this amendment is the one assumed in the House-passed budget resolution—the one that was written by the majority party. The fiscal year 1996 authorization in this amendment is the administration's own projection. These are numbers, in other words, that were developed by the majority.

I haven't heard very good arguments against these numbers. All we heard at markup was that we do not have to follow the budget resolution and that OMB sometimes changes its mind about budget projections. But this is irrelevant. I'm not arguing that we're

bound to follow these numbers, I'm arguing that they are realistic budget numbers proposed by the majority itself. They are numbers the majority proposed when it could not operate in a vacuum, but had to factor in budget restraints.

Now I want to be clear. My amendment still allows for significant growth in NSF—around 4 percent growth next year and about 3 percent in fiscal 1996. We're not talking about hardship here. Indeed, I fear the appropriators may not even be able to provide the funds sought in my amendment.

And let me also point out that my amendment reflects exactly the same relative program priorities within NSF as does the bill.

All that's at issue here is whether authorization bills are real efforts to set priorities in the real world, or whether they are opportunities to retreat into comforting fantasies.

Members who think Mr. Rogers is a children's program host and not a Member of Congress ought to vote with us.

Mr. Chairman, let me stress once again, 12 years I have had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. And for 12 consecutive years, I have been a champion of the National Science Foundation. For 12 years, I have been on that committee and for 12 consecutive years I have voted for more funding for the National Science Foundation.

But I am a realist. I have to deal, as all America does, in the real world.

The fact of the matter is, my colleagues, we now have a debt approximating \$4 trillion, which means that we are spending each and every day \$900 million just on interest on the national debt. That argues very strongly for some reason as we go about our business here.

What we are talking about is not \$3.2 billion, but \$3.15 billion, a \$50 million differential. That \$50 million would put our authorization in line with the majority package approved by the Committee on the Budget under the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has expired.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman from New York, and I very much enjoy the partnership that he and I have in the Subcommittee on Science of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, in which we have achieved quite a number of favorable goals in terms of enhancing and molding the Nation's research agenda. In fact, it is a rare occasion when he and I disagree on matters of fundamental policy.

□ 1520

We do, however, come to the floor today in disagreement with regard to the appropriate level of funding for the National Science Foundation for the next 2 years, so it is with a degree of reluctance in view of the excellent partnership that we have, but with heartfelt commitment nonetheless, that I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman.

His amendment would reduce the National Science Foundation's authorization by \$50 million in fiscal year 1995, and by \$158 million in fiscal year 1996. For fiscal year 1995, the amendment would follow report language that is contained in the report of the Committee on the Budget that accompanies the fiscal year 1995 budget resolution.

However, the Committee on the Budget has made a suggestion, and a suggestion only, with regard to funding for the National Science Foundation, and that suggestion binds neither the Committee on Appropriations nor does it bind the authorizing committees. Only the larger budget function category for science, and that is function number 250 that is contained in the joint budget resolution, is binding on the Committee on Appropriations, and that number leaves room for the National Science Foundation to be funded at the levels that are contained in our legislation.

In point of fact, the conference committee, which very shortly will be filed for the joint budget resolution, actually increases by \$100 million the amount that is available for that general science function, for the National Science Foundation and for other agencies that receive their funding pursuant to that budget function, so that amount is increased over the House number by \$100 million, both for outlays and for budget authority.

It is our committee's judgment, I would suggest, that should prevail with regard to this very important subject. The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is the most knowledgeable committee, I would suggest, regarding the success of the National Science Foundation's programs, and it is best positioned for that reason to judge the value of the National Science Foundation to the U.S. science and technology enterprise. We should not defer to the Committee on the Budget for that fundamental judgment.

For fiscal year 1996, the gentleman relies on the Office of Management and Budget's projection for the NSF budget in that year, but over time, I would point out that the OMB projections have varied widely from the actual administration budget requests and from the actual appropriations levels. They have been both above and below those requests and the actual outlays.

Far more reliable as a measure of the value of the National Science Foundation is the judgment of the Committee

on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the NSF's contributions to society. Those contributions have been quantified to some extent in studies conducted at the University of Pennsylvania, and suggest that the Nation receives a social rate of return of 128 percent for NSF-sponsored projects in terms of wealth creation and also in terms of improvements in our quality of life. So for every dollar that the NSF invests in a research project, we receive a return of at least \$1.28 in terms of societal improvement.

Studies consistently show that basic investments in research are the strongest and most consistent positive influences on productivity growth. That is certainly true with regard to NSF-sponsored programs.

With this level of funding, the NSF is still not at its limit in terms of its ability to fund excellent research projects. In 1992, the National Science Foundation left unfunded fully \$1 billion in proposals that had been rated through the peer review process as being excellent in quality. The NSF itself enlists the help of scientists throughout the country to evaluate the various proposals that are made for funding, and in 1992, that group of scientists found that fully \$1 billion in projects recommended to the NSF were excellent but could not be funded due to funding shortages.

The underfunding of the National Science Foundation has in fact been recognized on a bipartisan basis by administrations during the course of the last decade. Starting in 1988, the commitment was made by the Reagan administration to increase funding for the National Science Foundation over a period of 5 years by a factor of 100 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOUCHER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BOUCHER. Beginning in 1988, the administration made a commitment to double funding for the National Science Foundation over a period of 5 years, and the budgets that were recommended by Presidents of both political parties during the intervening years clearly reflect that commitment.

In 1988, the Reagan administration's recommended increase in funding was 16.5 percent; 19 percent in 1989; 14 percent in 1990; and in each of the years of the Bush administration, recommendations for funding increases for the NSF were 14 percent, 17 percent, 17 percent, and 16 percent.

The Clinton administration for fiscal year 1995 has recommended only a 6-percent increase, so I would suggest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] that his concern about budget deficits has already been well reflected in the recommendations that have been made by the administration

for NSF funding for the upcoming fiscal year, and that rate of increase is substantially less than what had been recommended by prior administrations. That level recommended by the Clinton administration is the level contained in the committee bill.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has himself recognized, as recently as last fall, the need for the National Science Foundation funding even more generous than the levels that are contained in the committee bill. Last year the gentleman offered a substitute during our subcommittee consideration that would fund the National Science Foundation at the level of \$3.28 billion. The complete bill, which is before the committee at the moment, sets that level at \$3.2 billion, and now the gentleman would have that level go below the \$3.2 billion, to \$3.15 billion.

Of the conflicting positions that the gentleman has taken, I would suggest that he got it right the first time. All that has changed in the meantime is a general suggestion contained in the Committee on the Budget report language, and based upon which, I think, the gentleman should not be swayed from his very sound earlier position.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the committee to reject this amendment, and in doing so, to confirm the excellent value and the continuing benefit that our society receives from the research that is sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOUCHER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I would just like to point out to my colleague that he is correct in reporting what activities occurred in the committee last year as a result of this gentleman's amendment. This year reflects the new realities, today. We are dealing with here and now.

Part of the problem with this Congress is, we tend to do things the same old way, year, after year, after year. I think the American people are demanding that we change, we reflect the existing realities of the day, rather than saying, we did it this way last year; therefore, we should do it this way again this year. That is how we got into the bind we are in right now.

I mean, a \$4 trillion national debt, spending \$900 million every single day just in interest on the national debt? The message I am receiving is, they want us to do things differently.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT]. I think that we need to realize the point that was made earlier by the gentleman from New York.

The funding numbers he is offering are not numbers developed by Republicans and not numbers that have been pulled out of the hat somewhere. These are numbers that were chosen by the majority. No Republicans were in support of the budget resolution that passed this House earlier this year. However, the Democrats have committed themselves to certain levels of budgetary discipline.

Mr. Chairman, this number for fiscal year 1995 is precisely the number that was included in that budget presentation. What are we told in the letter that came out from the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science? What we are told is that the Committee on the Budget report recommendations regarding individual agencies are not binding.

That is how we always treat these matters here. We pass budget resolutions, and then we say that they do not mean anything. We pass budget resolutions, and then we suggest that there are individual portions of them that, regardless of what the budget resolution said, can be changed around at whim.

The problem for us as authorizing committees is, I think, we lack credibility when we do that. If we get to wondering why the appropriators and others in this body treat us with some disdain on our budget numbers, this is a good example. When we pass budgets, the authorizing committees say, "That does not apply to us." When we pass authorizing legislation, we say, "Let us make it high enough that we can include everything we want to do, and we do not have to have the discipline. The discipline will show up in the appropriations process."

No wonder the appropriators then think it is within their realm to do what they want with the priorities that they determine. What the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] is saying here is let us at least live within the budget standards that were set by the Committee on the Budget. That is all he does in fiscal 1995. He says, "Let's stick with those numbers that were included in the budget that passed this House."

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the fiscal year 1996 numbers that are in the Boehlert amendment. In this case, that comes from the 5-year forecast of the NSF budget prepared by the Office of Management and Budget. That is not a Reagan number, that is not a Bush number, that is not a Republican number, it is not my number, it is not Mr. BOEHLERT's number. It is the number that is provided by the Office of Management and Budget, and in particular, by the director of the Office of Management and Budget under President Clin-

ton. I feel that it is important to note that in this time of budget cuts, both of the numbers in the Boehlert amendment allow for growth in the NSF budget. We are not talking about cutting anything here. We are talking about growth, real growth. We are talking about budget numbers that go up.

Mr. Chairman, now we have a discrepancy with the letter that was sent out by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER]. They note in their letter that the bill that we have before us provides for 6-percent growth for the budget for fiscal year 1996, and then they say, consistent with President Clinton's designation of NSF in a vision of change for America as one of the important parts of his investment strategy.

The problem is that President Clinton did not call for a 6-percent growth number. That is a misleading statement from this standpoint. President Clinton has called for a 3-percent growth to implement his vision of change for America.

Mr. Chairman, that is what is reflected in the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], and so the Boehlert amendment is consistent with what the administration has done when they have put real numbers down on real paper. Today, what we are being told on the House floor is, we ought not deal with reality. We ought to deal with wishes.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are tired of a Congress that deals with wish lists. The American people are troubled by massive deficits that are compiled by Congress every time it does one of these wish list bills. Let us get real. Let us have reality take over here a little bit. Let us at least stick with the numbers within the budget and the numbers that OMB has generated. Those will allow for real growth in the NSF budget. NSF is important enough to grow a little, but it is not important from the standpoint that we need to do a wish list out here, because that wish list will be destroyed in the appropriations process and it will take us out of the area of credibility in terms of setting priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I think the fundamental thing that the authorizing committee need to do is set priorities in these bills. When we use wish list numbers, we take away from our ability to set priorities and hand it over to the appropriators who will deal with real numbers.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] for the amendment and I urge its passage.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to praise all of the speakers who have spoken so far.

They are indeed exceptionally able and capable members of the committee. They are also extremely eloquent and I am reluctant sometimes to appear to be competing with them in the eloquence department because they have done such an excellent job. I commend all of them, particularly the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER], for making the most extensive and detailed defense of the numbers which we have in our bill that I can possibly imagine and there is little that I can do to extend that argument further.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to try and place this somewhat in perspective. We are talking basically about numbers for the 1996 fiscal year, not the fiscal year 1995, and we are talking about a bill in which all of the members of the committee are in about 99-percent agreement. We are not engaged in some bitter debate over major aspects of this legislation, which we all recognize is necessary and valuable. The question has to do with the interpretation of how closely we should follow the recommendations of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, normally I would be guided by the Committee on the Budget, normally, but not always. I would point out that in the conference on the budget resolution, which I have been advised by staff has just come back, they have put an additional \$100 million into the 250 science account above what was in the House bill. And I commend the conferees for agreeing on this kind of an increase.

Mr. Chairman, I use this figure merely to illustrate that we cannot really be precise about arguing over the fiscal year 1996 authorization numbers when we are subject to the kind of fluctuations that occur between the House and Senate Budget Committee, the annual changes that OMB makes in their own projections, and, believe me, they change their projections every year as to what the various agencies should have on a 5-year outlook.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to have just been looking at the ones for NASA, which is close to my heart, and every year the OMB, representing the President's position, has taken a drastically different position as to what the 5-year outlook for the NASA budget should be.

Mr. Chairman, I am not saying it is wrong because its changes ever year, I am just saying that there is uncertainty there and that we really are better off to look in our own wisdom at the value of the program, the NSF program, and decide what rational Members of Congress ought to do in deciding on what the second year out should be. We will probably change it within a year, but I have personally the conviction that for a program like NSF, which since 1988 no President has rec-

ommended less than a 14-percent increase per year, and this Congress is only recommending 6 percent, I do not understand why this indicates any abdication of responsibility. If Reagan and Bush could make these recommendations, recognizing the value of the program, which this Congress then cut, we did not agree with the President in any of those years, why cannot we now suggest that 6 percent is a reasonable level for 1996 and proceed as if we could accomplish that goal?

Mr. Chairman, that would be the limit on what the increase would be, that would be the authorization level. It probably will end up being less than that. I hope it would not be less than that, but I think this is reasonable, and I urge all the Members of the House to support that kind of a level. It does represent the best thinking of the committee. It does not seek to be determined by the Committee on the Budget or OMB or anybody else. This is our best recommendation to the House, and I think it deserves credibility.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boehlert amendment to lower the bill's multiyear authorization by \$208 million and bring the bill's authorization levels in line with the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 1995 and OMB's projected funding level for fiscal year 1996.

The National Science Foundation plays an important role in our Nation's basic research. It is the only agency whose primary mission is the support of fundamental, long-term, scientific research. As a result of the fine work of NSF, our Nation's base of scientific and engineering knowledge has increased and our Nation is better prepared to meet the challenges of the future.

Perhaps no one knows the importance of NSF's mission better than the gentleman from New York, who is offering this amendment. I have had the pleasure of serving with him on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and I have seen him champion the programs of NSF as the ranking member of NSF's authorization subcommittee. He has been, as I have been, a strong supporter of NSF and we both consider it a model agency.

However, Mr. Chairman, in these days of budget austerity, we must be mindful of our spending. Despite its good work, NSF cannot be exempted from the budget constraints all discretionary programs are facing. NSF should be subject to authorizations which conform with the assumptions in the House budget resolution.

If the gentleman's amendment passes, NSF will still continue to grow, but at a more fiscally responsible rate. Indeed, if we are to achieve effective

deficit reduction, our spending bills need to reflect our determination and commitment to limit spending.

Sound policy can, and must, coexist with fiscal responsibility. A vote in support of the Boehlert amendment is a vote for both the continued growth of NSF and for a responsible budget. I urge all my colleagues to support the Boehlert amendment.

□ 1540

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I am sensitive to the points that she has made in her statement.

I would only like to correct, however, one statement that was made, and that is with respect to the administration's request for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1995, and that request, in fact, was for a budget of \$3.2 billion. That is a 6-percent increase over the budget for the current fiscal year. That is the number that is contained in the committee bill which comes before us.

I simply did not want the impression to be left that we were asking for a level of increase in the committee bill in excess of that recommended by the administration. Our number targets exactly that recommended by the administration and is consistent with it in every way.

Mrs. MORELLA. How about OMB's recommendation? Is it also in conformity with what OMB has said with regard to its fitting the House bill?

Mr. BOUCHER. If the gentlewoman will yield further, I would respond by saying that the numbers reflected in the National Science Foundation budget request for fiscal year 1995 are also those concurred in by the Office of Management and Budget as, in fact, all of the budget numbers sent by the administration to the Congress are.

Mrs. MORELLA. I appreciate the comment the gentleman made.

I would like to say that I think that tightening the belt ever so slightly, which is what this amendment would do, would be appropriate.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. That was an interesting point that was just raised by the chairman of the subcommittee with regard to the numbers. He makes the point that their numbers are consistent with the President's original presentation.

However, when the Democratic budget was brought to the House floor, one of the points that they made was that they had massaged the President's numbers to do some other things in other areas. This was one of the areas that got massaged downward.

When we come back now with the authorization, what we are suggesting is, having had all that massaging take place, we are now going to boost it back up, and it seems to me it is entirely consistent for us to say once the House has acted in budget numbers, we ought to be consistent with that.

The gentlewoman is absolutely right with regard to the OMB number for 1996. That is a very firm number generated by the Director of Management and Budget that is reflected in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT]. I thank her for making the point.

Mr. BOUCHER. If the gentlewoman will yield further, I think, in view of those comments offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, it is worthy to note that the more definitive action of the budget formation process is yet to come, that is, the adoption in both Houses of a conference report adopting a joint budget resolution for fiscal year 1995.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. WALKER and by unanimous consent, Mrs. MORELLA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, that action is about to come as the House and the other body adopt a conference report on the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994.

The report of the conferees is now available. We know that the conferees, contrary to the action of the House, have added a \$100 million function; that is budget function No. 250 through which the National Science Foundation derives its budget authority, and so the Appropriations Committee in both bodies will be free to raise the level of funding for the National Science Foundation to a level that is consistent with that number.

They have the flexibility certainly to meet the number set forth in the committee bill being debated at the moment, and I would simply point out for that reason that it is particularly inappropriate for the committee at this time to be relying on a measure that was passed in the House and contained nothing but report language suggesting that there be a lower number for the National Science Foundation when that action is about to be superseded by the conference report on the joint budget resolution itself.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I think that raises an interesting point, because what the gentleman is now suggesting is exactly what I said before, that we are engaging in wish-list politics out here, because he cites the \$100

million and then suggests that in this one bill for this one agency that \$50 million of that money ought to be usurped.

The fact is that bill covers NASA. It covers the energy projects at the Department of Energy. It covers a very vast budget well beyond the National Science Foundation, and in one fell swoop it is suggested we should come out here and simply usurp \$50 million for a budget bill that has yet to pass either House.

We know the budget bill on which the gentleman from New York is relying has passed this House. The budget conference report has yet to pass either House. Even if it passes, the fact is there is only \$100 million there to work with, of which the gentleman wants to take 50.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when I first came to Congress 5 years ago, the National Science Foundation was funded at half of what will be authorized by this bill. To put it another way, even accounting for inflation, the National Science Foundation's budget has doubled since 1988. Not many agencies can boast of having their budget doubled in that time period.

The NSF's mission is significant, however. We know it is an important mission. Science obviously helps build the engine for future economic activity.

But in addition to the investments we as a Nation must make in science, that will not bear fruit immediately. We must look to our future and act prudently in managing the people's money, and that is what this debate is all about.

Are we being responsible? Are we being prudent at a time when we have limited resources? We are talking about a situation where we just cannot spend money on everything, and the public understands that and should understand that, and we should understand that and act accordingly.

At a time when we are spending hundreds of billions of dollars every year more than we are talking in, which threatens the national security of our country as nothing else, we must act responsibly, and that we have a system that the Democrats and Republicans have worked out together and decided that we are going to make that system work.

Today what we are seeing is an attempt to sidetrack, to go around, the system that has been established. It will not matter if, when we make tremendous scientific discoveries, because of something that is done by the National Science Foundation, will not make a difference at all if our country is absolutely broke and our economy is in a situation that we cannot capitalize on it.

Everyone knows we have got to be responsible. Everyone has spending projects they would like to spend money on. That is what this debate is all about, not that the National Science Foundation is not a worthy goal. But today we must abide by our own rules. This is not about cutting the budget of the National Science Foundation, for when the public is listening to this debate, I want them to fully understand no one on this side is suggesting cutting the budget whatsoever.

What we are talking about and has happened so often in this body is what we are talking about on this side is limiting the increase in spending in this Government agency. Our friends on the other side of the aisle like to suggest what that means is we are cutting the budget. That is not the way it works in the real world. In the real world the people on this side are saying yes, we can increase the budget, but we have to do it responsibly and prudently.

What we are hearing from the other side of the aisle is the rules be damned, this is really good, this is really a good thing, and we need to just forget the rules for right now.

All the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] will do is simply hold the authorization of this agency's budget numbers to what Congress has already established. We have already approved an overall budget, and it does not matter where those numbers have come from, Republican or Democrat. They are what we have agreed to. So let us stick with it and stick with our own budget. That is what responsibility is all about.

My chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], has rightfully protested when the Committee on Appropriations ignores the process and ignores our responsibilities and our rights and our powers as the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

□ 1550

When we authorize something, when it is ignored by the Appropriations Committee, my chairman rightfully protests. Well, we too have to be part of the system. When the budget agreement is made as to what is best for the overall United States of America, to be authorized and appropriated in this area, we as an authorizing committee have to abide by those rules if we expect the appropriators to do so.

Thus I would ask my colleagues to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT]. I applaud this act of responsibility on his part, and I hope that the American people can understand who is trying to get control of this terrible budget deficit that threatens all of our future.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BOUCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, once again, just for the sake of clarifying the record in this debate and making sure that no one leaves under the mistaken assumption with respect to what the Budget Committees in both houses are preparing to do, it should be pointed out that the Congress, through its budget formation process, has not adopted the number of \$3.15 billion recommended in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York; but in point of fact, the conference report on the concurrent budget resolution will be taken up very shortly here in the House and will add fully \$100 million above the House number to the general science function, to function 250.

Then the Committee on Appropriations, in its wisdom, can choose among the various science agencies which will receive that increase in funding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROHRABACHER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I point out to my distinguished chairman, I repeat what the ranking member, the ranking Republican on the full committee, Mr. WALKER, has to say: we are dealing with budget function 250. So when you talk about the \$100 million, that \$100 million is not earmarked for NSF; that \$100 million is in a broad budget function that has to deal with NASA, it has to deal with Department of Energy research projects, a whole wide range of activities that it has to deal with.

So the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] was right on point in responding to that comment, and I appreciate it.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BOUCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In response to those remarks, I would simply point out that we in this action are not requiring that the Committee on Appropriations take any step to fund the NSF at any given level. We are simply providing the authorization authority that is necessary if the Appropriations Committee should choose, for whatever reasons are sufficient to it, to provide the level of funding that we are setting forth for the National Science Foundation.

There will be budget authority for it as a consequence of the conference report on the budget resolution. We are simply making sure there is authorization through this process for the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent and on request of Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ROHRABACHER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Well, then, I say to my distinguished subcommittee chairman, he is running contrary to the wishes of the full committee chairman and all of us who serve on this authorizing committee. We are not willing to cede all decisionmaking to the appropriators. I am embarrassed to even suggest that we might consider that.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, I would just note for the public this is a fascinating debate because it is dealing with a highly technical issue and it is also dealing with a process that is very difficult to understand.

I believe that what we are seeing today is responsibility on this side of the aisle and good intentions on that side of the aisle. Today we are \$200 billion in debt, we are spending more than we are taking in every year. I think instead of good intentions, it is time to act responsibly.

I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. This amendment would reduce the National Science Foundation's budget authorization for the next fiscal year by \$50 million and \$158 million in fiscal year 1996. We should not be reducing the 1995 authorization below the level requested by the administration at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I have a number of concerns about section 203 of the H.R. 3254 which attempts to define the eligibility for research facility awards. The second part of the proviso states that the Director of NSF shall exclude from consideration—for a modernization grant—any institution that receives funds for repair, renovation, replacement to and construction of one of its facilities through a non-competitive, nonmerit based award process.

The language, as written, is somewhat vague. Nowhere in the bill does it outline the definition of an earmark and how institutions would be included or excluded. Additionally, this is a huge administrative burden on NSF to not only define an earmark, but then enforce this language when considering which institutions should receive modernization funds and which should not. Also, it does not address those projects that have been specifically authorized.

There is also a concern that this provision affects universities funded by agencies other than NSF and is beyond the jurisdiction of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. As an example, according to the Department of Veterans Affairs, this amendment to the Academic Research Facilities Modernization Act of 1988 has the potential for excluding uni-

versities affiliated with the Department of Veterans Affairs from participating in NSF's infrastructure program.

Finally, the funding levels in the authorization bill stand in clear contrast to the Appropriation subcommittee's long standing priorities for math and science education—particularly at the precollege level, as well as for research support for individual science and engineering researchers at this Nation's colleges and universities. In math and science education, the authorization bill cuts \$16.4 million out of the President's request and funds it with last year's level. The Appropriations Committee has led the way to rebuild and strengthen the NSF's math and science education programs, bringing them back to life after the Reagan administration sought to zero them out.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the conferees will address this issue in conference.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 227, noes 197, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

AYES—227

Allard	DeLay	Hunter
Andrews (NJ)	Deutsch	Hutchinson
Andrews (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Hutto
Archer	Dickey	Hyde
Armey	Dornan	Inglis
Bachus (AL)	Dreier	Inhofe
Baker (CA)	Duncan	Istook
Baker (LA)	Dunn	Jacobs
Ballenger	Edwards (TX)	Johnson (CT)
Barca	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Barrett (NE)	English	Kaptur
Barrett (WI)	Everett	Kasich
Bartlett	Ewing	Kim
Barton	Fawell	King
Bateman	Fields (TX)	Kingston
Bentley	Fish	Klein
Bereuter	Fowler	Klink
Bilbray	Franks (CT)	Klug
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Knollenberg
Billey	Galleghy	Kolbe
Blute	Gallo	Kreidler
Boehlert	Gekas	Kyl
Boehner	Geren	Laughlin
Bonilla	Gilchrest	Lazio
Brewster	Gillmor	Lehman
Bunning	Gilman	Levy
Burton	Gingrich	Lewis (CA)
Buyer	Glickman	Lewis (FL)
Callahan	Goodlatte	Lightfoot
Calvert	Goodling	Linder
Camp	Goss	Lipinski
Canady	Grams	Livingston
Cardin	Greenwood	Machtley
Castle	Gunderson	Manzullo
Chapman	Hall (TX)	Margolies-
Clement	Hancock	Mezvinsky
Clinger	Hansen	Martinez
Coble	Hastert	McCandless
Combest	Hefley	McCollum
Condit	Herger	McCrery
Cooper	Hoagland	McDade
Coppersmith	Hobson	McHugh
Cox	Hoekstra	McInnis
Crane	Hoke	McKeon
Crapo	Holden	McMillan
Cunningham	Horn	Meehan
Danner	Houghton	Menendez
DeFazio	Hughes	Meyers

Mica	Ramstad
Michel	Ravenel
Miller (FL)	Regula
Minge	Roberts
Molinari	Rogers
Montgomery	Rohrabacher
Moorhead	Ros-Lehtinen
Morella	Roth
Myers	Roukema
Nussle	Rowland
Ortiz	Royce
Orton	Santorom
Oxley	Saxton
Packard	Schaefer
Pallone	Schiff
Parker	Schroeder
Paxon	Schumer
Penny	Sensenbrenner
Peterson (MN)	Shaw
Petri	Shays
Pickett	Shepherd
Pombo	Shuster
Porter	Siskisky
Portman	Skeen
Poshard	Skelton
Pryce (OH)	Slattery
Quillen	Smith (MI)
Quinn	Smith (NJ)

NOES—197

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Oberstar
Ackerman	Gibbons	Obey
Andrews (ME)	Gonzalez	Oliver
Applegate	Gordon	Owens
Bacchus (FL)	Green	Pastor
Baessler	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Barlow	Hamburg	Pelosi
Becerra	Hamilton	Peterson (FL)
Beilenson	Harman	Pickle
Berman	Hastings	Pomeroy
Bevill	Hayes	Price (NC)
Bishop	Hefner	Rahall
Boniior	Hilliard	Rangel
Borski	Hinchey	Reed
Boucher	Hochbrueckner	Reynolds
Brooks	Hoyer	Richardson
Browder	Huffington	Roemer
Brown (CA)	Inlee	Rose
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Rostenkowski
Brown (OH)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Bryant	Johnson (SD)	Rush
Byrne	Johnson, E.B.	Sabo
Cantwell	Johnston	Sanders
Carr	Kanjorski	Sarpalius
Clay	Kennedy	Sawyer
Clayton	Kennelly	Schenk
Clyburn	Kildee	Scott
Coleman	Kleczka	Serrano
Collins (IL)	Kopetski	Skaggs
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Slaughter
Conyers	Lambert	Smith (IA)
Costello	Lancaster	Spratt
Coyne	Lantos	Stark
Cramer	LaRocco	Stokes
Darden	Leach	Strickland
de la Garza	Levin	Studds
de Lugo (VI)	Lewis (GA)	Swett
Deal	Lloyd	Swift
DeLauro	Lowey	Synar
Dellums	Maloney	Tanner
Derrick	Mann	Tejeda
Dicks	Manton	Thompson
Dingell	Markay	Thornton
Dixon	Matsui	Thurman
Dooley	Mazzoli	Torres
Durbin	McCloskey	Torricelli
Edwards (CA)	McCurdy	Towns
Ehlers	McDermott	Traficant
Eshoo	McHale	Tucker
Evans	McKinney	Underwood (GU)
Faleomavaega	McNulty	Unsoeld
(AS)	Meek	Valentine
Farr	Mfume	Velazquez
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Vento
Fields (LA)	Mineta	Volkmer
Filner	Mink	Waters
Fingerhut	Moakley	Watt
Flake	Mollohan	Waxman
Foglietta	Moran	Wheat
Ford (TN)	Murphy	Whitten
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Williams
Frost	Nadler	
Furse	Neal (MA)	
Gejdenson	Norton (DC)	

Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Wilson
Wise
Blackwell
Collins (GA)
Doolittle
Engel
Ford (MI)

Woolsey
Wyden
Grandy
Long
Neal (NC)
Ridge

Wynn
Yates
Romero-Barcelo
(PR)
Sangmeister
Sharp
Washington

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1616

Messrs. ZELIFF, LEWIS of California, BILBRAY, and HOLDEN, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, and Messrs. ORTIZ, KLEIN, HALL of Texas, and MEEHAN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: At the appropriate place, add the following:

TITLE II SEC. . SENSE-OF-CONGRESS REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Director shall provide to each recipient of assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

□ 1620

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, in the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with assistance under this act, the Congress expresses the essence of the Congress that those purchases be made in America. In addition, that any recipient of assistance under this bill would get a notice that would basically outline that sense of Congress resolution listed in the amendment.

Let me say to Members of the Congress, in the last 10 years, we had 2.5 trillion dollars' worth of new debt and 1.6 trillion dollars' worth of trade deficits. I ask the committee to accept the amendment.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have examined on this side this amendment. We find it to be appropriate, and would urge its adoption by the committee.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOUCHER. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to congratulate the author for his continuing efforts to see to it that we purchase more of the goods that are made by our own workers in this country. I think it is an excellent amendment, and will support it very strongly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON:

At the end of Title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 213. DENIAL OF AWARDS OF GRANTS OR CONTRACTS TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS WHICH PREVENT MILITARY RECRUITING.

(a) DENIAL OF FUNDS.—The Director may not make a grant or award a contract to any educational institution that has a policy of denying, or which effectively prevents, any of the military services of the United States from obtaining for military recruiting purposes—

(1) entry to campuses or access to students on campuses; or

(2) access to directory information pertaining to students; consistent with applicable law.

(b) PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINATION.—In determining compliance with subsection (a), the Director shall—(1) include on any grant or contract application questions as to whether the educational institution has, by policy or practice, effectively denied such entry or access for recruiting purposes; and (2) inquire of the Department of Defense whether such entry or access has been denied by an institution before awarding such grant or contract to it.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—(1) the term "student" means an individual enrolled in an educational institution who is 17 years of age or older; and (2) the term "directory information" means, with respect to a student, the student's name, address, telephone listing, date and place of birth, level of education, degrees received, and the most recent educational institution enrolled in by the student.

Mr. SOLOMON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order with respect to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] reserves a point of order against the amendment. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, during recent congressional hearings, Congress has been made aware that military recruiters in various educational facilities across the country were being

denied access to educational facilities. Preventing military recruiters from explaining the benefits of an honorable career in our armed services of the United States.

Mr. Chairman and Members, that is outrageous. My amendment today would simply prevent any funds authorized in this act from going to institutions which prevent military recruiting on their campuses.

The amendment is short and very direct. Allow me just to read the main body of it. The Director of the National Science Foundation may not make a grant or an award of a contract to any educational facility that has a policy of denying or which effectively prevents any of the military services of the United States from obtaining military recruiting purposes, meaning entry to campuses or access to students on campuses or access to directory information pertaining to those students.

Mr. Chairman, we all know what kind of a strain our military institutions and personnel have been under recently. Deep budget cuts have cut into training, forced crews to work longer hours with less maintained equipment, and shortened promising careers.

Mr. Chairman, the mission of our Armed Forces has become muddled in this post-cold-war world. Now, Mr. Chairman, as we know, a number of educational institutions across the country are receiving massive amounts of Federal dollars included in this bill before us today, yet they are denying the Department of Defense the opportunity to recruit on their campuses. I think that is appallingly hypocritical, Mr. Chairman.

Institutions that are receiving grants and awards from one or more Federal departments are in turn attempting to deny another Federal department, the Department of Defense, access to their campuses. We as guardians of the Federal purse should not allow this to stand, Mr. Chairman.

No one in an institution which is receiving any Federal moneys should be allowed to block our recruiters from explaining the educational and career opportunities in our all-voluntary military.

I think all Members should listen to this, because if you go back home and talk to your recruiters you will know: Testimony by the Pentagon and recent surveys by the press across the Nation show that military recruiting is down over the past 2 years. Recruiters are already having trouble meeting their quotas as it is. This is a dangerous development with potential hot spots all around the world, with President Clinton threatening to put American troops in Bosnia, and, over my standing objections, putting American troops into Haiti.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very serious issue. Even in a period of

downsizing, we are unable to find enough recruits to fill the current numbers of slots. It may be debatable as to why this is so, Mr. Chairman, but the fact is, more importantly, recruiting is where readiness begins, and all Members know that. Recruiting is the key to the all-voluntary military, which has been such a spectacular success.

Mr. Chairman, we only have to recall the utter demolition of Saddam Hussein's army to know what a success the All-Volunteer Force has been. But there was a time back in the 1970's when the All-Volunteer Force was in a deplorable condition, when we tried to rescue hostages in Iran. We had to cannibalize about 15 helicopter gunships just to get 5 that would work, and only 3 of those did. You all remember the results of that rescue mission.

Because of under funding, many of our top military officers and enlisted men had left the military to find better paying jobs, and we were unable to attract the best possible young people.

We began to change this in the early 1980's on a bipartisan basis by dramatically improving pay and benefits for volunteers. The result is a force that is better educated today, better trained, and the most highly motivated in the entire history of our military. Today over 95 percent of our personnel are high school graduates, and this success is in large part due to recruiting on school grounds.

□ 1630

Mr. Chairman, the reason our military has been so successful is that recruiters have been able to enlist such promising volunteers for our armed forces by going into high schools and colleges and universities informing young people of the increased opportunities that an honorable military service can provide, plus the bill of rights of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] giving them \$25,000 in earned educational benefits.

The readiness of our Armed Forces is on the wane today, and we must reverse this slide. We can begin by telling recipients of Federal money, that means colleges and universities, that if they do not like the armed services or its policies, that is all right.

That is freedom of speech. They are welcome to say that. But do not expect Federal dollars to support their interference with our military recruiters.

I would just like to make one last point, Mr. Chairman, for those of my colleagues who may worry that this kind of legislation tramples on States' rights. Again, let me repeat, I have no problem with schools or any private institution taking a stand on public issues and implementing policies accordingly. But when an institution is receiving Federal dollars, that gives the Federal Government some rights, too. And this amendment only deals with

those institutions receiving Federal dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOLOMON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, one of the most respected Members of this House who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Forces and Personnel.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I will just take a moment of the gentleman's time.

I want to point out that we had a hearing earlier this year in the subcommittee, which I am privileged to chair, dealing with the recruiting for the young men and young women in all of the services. Quite honestly, there is a problem.

There is less propensity for the young people in our country to look toward the military for either a career or for enlistment. It bothers me that there is any impediment for them to take the opportunity to join.

The same institutions that are receiving the benefits from the GI bill might be, on other occasions, impeding people from taking advantage of joining the service.

I think the gentleman is right on track. I intend to vote with him.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his cogent remarks.

Mr. Chairman, the courts have upheld similar legislation of mine in the past, such as the 1982 amendment that denied Federal education funds to students who failed to register for the draft and also prohibiting draft evaders from participating in job training programs, federally funded.

The concept behind this amendment today is exactly the same, and I would certainly urge the Members to support my amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

A couple of years ago, when we had the Desert Shield-Desert Storm debate, I think we elevated ourselves in the House of Representatives by reconciling in many ways with our military. Even those who did not believe we should move forward in Desert Storm came out of the debate assuring the Nation and our colleagues that we would all support our troops.

We saw those bumper stickers, "Support Our Troops," on hundreds of thousands of vehicles throughout the Nation. And when our troops came home, we let them know that we really appreciated them.

Our military is a very, very important part of our society. It is an honorable profession, as the gentleman has said. It is respected. It is dignified. It deserves our support.

By allowing our institutions that receive Federal dollars to reject recruiters, we are allowing that wedge to be driven once again between the military and another important part of our society, those are the institutions that train and educate our young people.

This is a very, very important amendment. By passing the Solomon amendment, we are going to send another message of support to the people that wear the uniform of the United States and follow our flag. I support the gentleman's amendment. I think it is very, very good.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support. He has been a longstanding Member that has supported our military.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOLOMON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to propound a question with respect to how the gentleman interprets the recent addition that was made to the base text amendment. The addition that is written in on this amendment on line 7, following the phrase that is denumerated paragraph number 2, says, "consistent with applicable law."

My question to the gentleman is whether he intends that that new language will modify the language on line 7, designated paragraph 2 only, or whether it also will modify the language on the preceding line, line 6, designated paragraph 1?

I would assume that it is designed to modify both paragraphs, but I want the gentleman's interpretation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, let me explain it this way. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOLOMON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Virginia that he knows that we had a problem in drafting the amendment to make it germane. Even though I believe that it is a limitation amendment, which should be allowed, I have every reason to believe the Parliamentarians would rule against me and in favor of the gentleman raising a point of order against it.

Therefore, we had to modify it by adding the terms "consistent with applicable law."

It does apply to line 6 as well. In effect, it makes this a sense-of-Congress resolution rather than binding. We would hope to pass it over here in this forum and then have the Senate adopt it in its original form where it will become law.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

I would only ask this additional question.

The gentleman has explained that his new phrase "consistent with applicable law" is designed to modify the language on both lines 6 and 7. That is what I would have assumed as well.

I ask the gentleman this additional question: Does the gentleman believe that he is adding any requirements that do not already exist in present law through the general text of his amendment? Will this amendment, if adopted, change the required conduct of universities in terms of the access and information they provide?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman, it is not my intention, by rendering this new modification, to create new law. It is applicable law. That is my intent.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman agree that with the addition of the language "consistent with applicable law" that there would be no new conduct required of universities as a result of the passage of this resolution?

□ 1640

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, the gentleman is correct. We hope to remedy that when the bill is brought up in the Senate.

Mr. BOUCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we understand, based on this colloquy, that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] will not be pressing his point of order, and it is based on the gentleman's explanation that with the added language, this does not create any additional legal requirement, and is simply an expression of the Congress, and I assume that that is the basis on which there would be no further pressing of the point of order.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is absolutely correct in his observation.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. It is a rare pleasure to be in such agreement with the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] has reserved a point of order. Does the gen-

tleman wish to press the point of order?

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. Chairman, some institutions of higher education in this country need to be put on notice that their policies of ambivalence or hostility towards our Nation's armed services do not go unnoticed—either by this House or by the American people.

A growing, and misguided, sense of moral superiority is creeping into the policies or colleges and universities in this country when it comes to such things as military recruiting or ROTC activities on campus. On April 22, for example, California State University at Sacramento announced that it would phase out its ROTC programs because some at the university disagreed with military personnel standards—standards based on Federal law passed in this Congress.

Examples like this should be seen for what they are—outrageous. It is nothing less than a backhanded slap at the honor and dignity of service in our Nation's armed forces; at those who have worn our Nation's uniform before; and at this Congress which has set in law military personnel standards.

These colleges and universities need to know that their starry-eyed idealism comes with a price. If they are too good, or too righteous to treat our Nation's military with the respect it deserves; allow ROTC units to operate; or afford our Nation's armed services the same recruiting opportunities offered to private corporations—then they may also be too good to receive the generous level of taxpayer dollars presently enjoyed by many institutions of higher education in America.

For our young men training to defend the freedoms of all Americans, and for all those who have proudly worn the uniform of this country, I urge my colleagues to support the Solomon amendment, and send a message over the wall of the ivory tower.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, in order to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Science of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. Chairman, under section 101(e) of H.R. 3254, the National Science Foundation is authorized to support education activities to encourage the participation of minorities who are underrepresented in science, engineering, and mathematics.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask, is it the intent of this section to direct the Na-

tional Science Foundation to work with already-established minority engineering programs in the Nation's specific institutions in order to advance and increase participation of minority engineers at all levels of education?

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would indicate that the gentleman is correct. It is the committee's intent that the National Science Foundation works with all science and engineering programs that have been successful in increasing the participation of underrepresented groups in science and engineering research and education.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the full committee agreed to include language in the final committee report that calls for the improvement of minority participation in science and engineering education. It is of fundamental importance that minority students have an opportunity to participate fully in science and engineering endeavors, especially at the undergraduate level.

It is my hope that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will look further into this matter to provide adequate Federal resources for minority students of science and engineering at all levels of education. I thank the distinguished chairman for his support in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3254, the National Science Foundation Act. NSF is the only Federal agency with the sole mission to support basic science and engineering research and education in our Nation's schools, colleges and universities. NSF is an important participant in research efforts in areas such as high performance computing, and communications, advanced materials, biotechnology and advanced manufacturing. Innovation in these areas is key to creating the economy of the future.

If we are to realize the fullest potential for our Nation's economic future, we must ensure that opportunities exist for all Americans. To that end, I am pleased that the Science, Space, and Technology Committee adopted my amendment to support education efforts for underrepresented groups in science and engineering. There is a vast untapped resource in the children of our Nation. We must not let value of our young people's imagination be diminished by a failure to acknowledge that everyone—regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, disability, or financial situation—may have something valuable to offer for the future of our great Nation.

I want to thank Science Subcommittee Chairman BOUCHER and ranking member BOEHLERT for their leadership and vision on this matter. By investing in our future now through funding the National Science Foundation, we can provide hope for all Americans that they will have a high-paying, high-quality job that will give the men and women of this country the financial security they need to raise a family.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3254, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1994.

This bill represents an important step forward in establishing strong basic research in the fields of science and engineering. It clarifies NSF missions, expands NSF participation in international scientific cooperation, and supports new education for underrepresented groups in science and engineering.

NSF is the premier Federal agency for supporting research in physical and mathematical sciences at universities. The Foundation has played a pivotal role in the post-war era by nurturing excellence in U.S.-university research and producing high-caliber scientists and engineers.

The NSF bill authorizes a 6-percent increase in funding levels in fiscal year 1995. This increase is on par with the President's fiscal year 1995 Budget request which emphasizes new technology development in the area of high-performance computing and the establishment of an information superhighway.

My congressional district, which is the home of Silicon Valley and Stanford University, have together made tremendous progress in high-performance computing technology. The NSF is now well poised to complement their efforts by providing new research grants.

H.R. 3254 also authorizes programs to encourage women, minorities, and other groups who are underrepresented in science to seek careers in this field. I believe these groups have not been adequately integrated into our Nation's most prestigious scientific bodies.

This is especially the case for women who represent an increasing percentage of those students in science and engineering degree programs but who are still employed in low numbers in industry, academic institutions, and government research agencies.

I urge my colleagues to support the NSF authorization bill as a way to begin dismantling the barriers which discourage women and minorities from participating in science. Bringing down these barriers will provide a more diverse and knowledgeable science base and enhance this Nation's economic competitiveness.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

□ 1645

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

SERRANO) having assumed the chair, Mr. OBERSTAR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3254) to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 414, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the just-passed so-called Solomon amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: At the end of Title II, add the following new section:

SEC. 213. DENIAL OF AWARDS OF GRANTS OR CONTRACTS TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS WHICH PREVENT MILITARY RECRUITING.

(a) DENIAL OF FUNDS.—The Director may not make a grant or award a contract to any educational institution that has a policy of denying, or which effectively prevents, any of the military services of the United States from obtaining for military recruiting purposes—

(1) entry to campuses or access to students on campuses; or

(2) access to directory information pertaining to students; consistent with applicable law.

(b) PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINATION.—In determining compliance with subsection (a), the Director shall—(1) include on any grant or contract application questions as to whether the educational institution has, by policy or practice, effectively denied such entry or access for recruiting purposes; and (2) inquire of the Department of Defense whether such entry or access has been denied by an institution before awarding such grant or contract to it.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—(1) the term "student" means an individual enrolled in an educational institution who is 17 years of age or older; and (2) the term "directory information" means, with respect to a student, the student's name, address, telephone listing, date and place of birth, level of education, degrees received, and the most recent educational institution enrolled in by the student.

Mr. SOLOMON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 331, noes 90, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

AYES—331

Ackerman	Dejeu	Kim
Allard	Duncan	King
Andrews (TX)	Dunn	Kingston
Applegate	Durbin	Klecza
Archer	Edwards (TX)	Klein
Army	Emerson	Klink
Bacchus (FL)	English	Klug
Bachus (AL)	Everett	Knollenberg
Baessler	Ewing	Kolbe
Baker (CA)	Fawell	Kreidler
Baker (LA)	Fazio	Kyl
Ballenger	Fields (LA)	LaFalce
Barca	Fields (TX)	Lambert
Barcia	Fingerhut	Lancaster
Barlow	Fish	Lantos
Barrett (NE)	Flake	LaRocco
Bartlett	Ford (TN)	Laughlin
Barton	Fowler	Lazio
Bateman	Franks (CT)	Leach
Bentley	Franks (NJ)	Lehman
Bereuter	Frost	Levin
Bevill	Gallegly	Levy
Bilbray	Gallo	Lewis (CA)
Bilirakis	Gekas	Lewis (FL)
Bishop	Geren	Lightfoot
Bliley	Gibbons	Linder
Blute	Gilchrest	Lipinski
Boehlert	Gillmor	Livingston
Boehner	Gilman	Lloyd
Borski	Gingrich	Machtley
Boucher	Glickman	Mann
Brewster	Gonzalez	Manton
Brooks	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Browder	Goodling	Margolies-
Brown (FL)	Gordon	Mezvisinsky
Brown (OH)	Goss	Martinez
Bryant	Grams	Mazzoli
Bunning	Green	McCandless
Burton	Greenwood	McCloskey
Buyer	Gunderson	McCollum
Byrne	Hall (OH)	McCrery
Callahan	Hall (TX)	McCurdy
Calvert	Hamilton	McDade
Camp	Hancock	McHale
Canady	Hansen	McHugh
Cantwell	Hastert	McInnis
Cardin	Hayes	McKeon
Carr	Hefley	McMillan
Castle	Hefner	McNulty
Chapman	Heger	Menendez
Clement	Hilliard	Meyers
Clinger	Hobson	Mica
Clyburn	Hochbrueckner	Michel
Coble	Hoekstra	Miller (FL)
Coleman	Hoke	Minge
Combest	Holden	Molinari
Condit	Horn	Mollohan
Cooper	Houghton	Montgomery
Coppersmith	Hoyer	Moorhead
Costello	Huffington	Moran
Cox	Hughes	Morella
Cramer	Hunter	Murphy
Crane	Hutchinson	Murtha
Crapo	Hutto	Myers
Cunningham	Hyde	Neal (NC)
Danner	Inglis	Nussle
Darden	Inhofe	Obey
de la Garza	Inslee	Ortiz
Deal	Istook	Orton
DeLay	Jacobs	Oxley
Derrick	Jefferson	Packard
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Pallone
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (GA)	Parker
Dickey	Johnson (SD)	Pastor
Dicks	Johnson, Sam	Paxon
Dingell	Kaptur	Payne (VA)
Dixon	Kasich	Penny
Dooley	Kennelly	Peterson (FL)
Dornan	Kildee	Peterson (MN)

Petri	Saxton
Pickett	Schaefer
Pickle	Schiff
Pombo	Schumer
Pomeroy	Sensenbrenner
Porter	Shaw
Portman	Shays
Poshard	Shepherd
Price (NC)	Shuster
Pryce (OH)	Sisisky
Quillen	Skeen
Quinn	Skelton
Rahall	Slattery
Ramstad	Smith (IA)
Ravenel	Smith (MI)
Reed	Smith (NJ)
Regula	Smith (OR)
Richardson	Smith (TX)
Roberts	Snowe
Roemer	Solomon
Rogers	Spence
Rohrabacher	Spratt
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns
Rose	Stenholm
Roth	Strickland
Roukema	Stump
Rowland	Stupak
Royce	Sundquist
Sabo	Swett
Santorum	Synar
Sarpalious	Talent
Sawyer	Tanner

Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Towns
Trafficant
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Sundquist
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—90

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Andrews (NJ)	Hamburg	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Rangel
Becerra	Hastings	Reynolds
Beilenson	Hinchey	Rostenkowski
Berman	Hoagland	Roybal-Allard
Bonior	Johnson, E.B.	Rush
Brown (CA)	Johnston	Sanders
Clay	Kanjorski	Schenck
Clayton	Kennedy	Schroeder
Collins (IL)	Kopetski	Scott
Collins (MI)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Conyers	Lowe	Skaggs
Coyne	Maloney	Slaughter
DeFazio	Markey	Stark
DeLauro	Matsui	Stokes
Dellums	McDermott	Studds
Edwards (CA)	McKinney	Swift
Ehlers	Meehan	Thompson
Engel	Meek	Thornton
Eshoo	Mfume	Torres
Evans	Miller (CA)	Tucker
Farr	Mineta	Unsoeld
Filner	Mink	Velazquez
Foglietta	Moakley	Waters
Ford (MI)	Nadler	Watt
Frank (MA)	Neal (MA)	Waxman
Furse	Oberstar	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Olver	Wyden
Gephardt	Owens	Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews (ME)	Doolittle	Sangmeister
Blackwell	Grandy	Sharp
Bonilla	Long	Washington
Collins (GA)	Ridge	

□ 1709

Ms. FURSE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, VENTO, and HEFNER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 396, noes 22, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

AYES—396

Abercrombie	Coppersmith	Grams
Ackerman	Costello	Green
Allard	Cox	Greenwood
Andrews (ME)	Coyne	Gunderson
Andrews (NJ)	Cramer	Gutierrez
Andrews (TX)	Crapo	Hall (OH)
Applegate	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Archer	Danner	Hamburg
Bacchus (FL)	de la Garza	Hamilton
Bachus (AL)	Deal	Hansen
Baesler	DeFazio	Harman
Baker (CA)	DeLauro	Hastert
Baker (LA)	DeLay	Hastings
Barca	Dellums	Hayes
Barcia	Derrick	Hefley
Barlow	Deutsch	Hefner
Barrett (NE)	Diaz-Balart	Hilliard
Barrett (WI)	Dickey	Hoagland
Bartlett	Dicks	Hobson
Barton	Dingell	Hochbrueckner
Bateman	Dixon	Hoke
Becerra	Dooley	Holden
Beilenson	Dornan	Horn
Bentley	Dreier	Houghton
Bereuter	Dunn	Hoyer
Berman	Durbin	Huffington
Bevill	Edwards (CA)	Hughes
Bilbray	Edwards (TX)	Hutchinson
Bilirakis	Ehlers	Hutto
Bishop	Emerson	Hyde
Biley	Engel	Inhofe
Blute	English	Inlee
Boehlert	Eshoo	Istook
Boehner	Evans	Jacobs
Bonilla	Everett	Jefferson
Bonior	Ewing	Johnson (CT)
Borski	Farr	Johnson (GA)
Boucher	Fawell	Johnson (SD)
Brewster	Fazio	Johnson, E. B.
Brooks	Fields (LA)	Johnson, Sam
Browder	Fields (TX)	Johnston
Brown (CA)	Flner	Kanjorski
Brown (FL)	Fingerhut	Kaptur
Brown (OH)	Flake	Kasich
Bryant	Foglietta	Kennedy
Bunning	Ford (MI)	Kennelly
Buyer	Ford (TN)	Kildee
Byrne	Fowler	Kim
Callahan	Frank (MA)	King
Calvert	Franks (CT)	Kingston
Camp	Franks (NJ)	Klecza
Canady	Frost	Klein
Cantwell	Furse	Klink
Cardin	Galleghy	Klug
Carr	Gallo	Knollenberg
Castle	Gejdenson	Kolbe
Chapman	Gekas	Kopetski
Clay	Gephardt	Kreidler
Clayton	Geren	Kyl
Clement	Gibbons	LaFalce
Clinger	Gilchrest	Lambert
Clyburn	Gillmor	Lancaster
Coleman	Gilman	Lantos
Collins (IL)	Gingrich	LaRocco
Collins (MI)	Glickman	Laughlin
Combest	Gonzalez	Lazio
Condit	Goodlatte	Leach
Conyers	Gordon	Lehman
Cooper	Goss	Levin

Levy	Orton	Slattery
Lewis (CA)	Owens	Slaughter
Lewis (FL)	Oxley	Smith (IA)
Lewis (GA)	Packard	Smith (MI)
Lightfoot	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
Linder	Parker	Smith (OR)
Lipinski	Pastor	Smith (TX)
Livingston	Payne (NJ)	Snowe
Lloyd	Payne (VA)	Spence
Lowey	Pelosi	Spratt
Machley	Penny	Stark
Maloney	Peterson (FL)	Stearns
Mann	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
Manton	Petri	Stokes
Manzullo	Pickett	Strickland
Margolies-	Pickle	Studds
Mezvinsky	Pommo	Stupak
Markey	Pomeroy	Sundquist
Martinez	Porter	Swett
Matsui	Portman	Swift
Mazzoli	Poshard	Synar
McCandless	Price (NC)	Talent
McCloskey	Price (OH)	Tanner
McCollum	Quillen	Taylor (MS)
McCurdy	Quinn	Tejeda
McDade	Rahall	Thomas (CA)
McDermott	Rangel	Thomas (WY)
McHale	Ravenel	Thompson
McHugh	Reed	Thornton
McInnis	Regula	Thurman
McKeon	Reynolds	Torkildsen
McKinney	Richardson	Torres
McMillan	Roemer	Torricelli
McNulty	Rogers	Towns
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Trafiacant
Meek	Ros-Lehtinen	Tucker
Menendez	Rose	Unsoeld
Meyers	Rostenkowski	Upton
Mfume	Roukema	Valentine
Mica	Rowland	Velasquez
Michel	Roybal-Allard	Vento
Miller (CA)	Rush	Visclosky
Miller (FL)	Sabo	Volkmer
Mineta	Sanders	Vucanovich
Minge	Santorum	Walker
Mink	Sarpalius	Walsh
Moakley	Sawyer	Waters
Molinar	Saxton	Watt
Mollohan	Schaefer	Waxman
Montgomery	Schen	Weldon
Moorhead	Schiff	Whitten
Moran	Schroeder	Williams
Morella	Schumer	Wilson
Murphy	Scott	Wise
Murtha	Serrano	Wolf
Myers	Sharp	Woolsey
Nadler	Shaw	Wyden
Neal (MA)	Shays	Wynn
Neal (NC)	Shepherd	Yates
Nussle	Shuster	Young (AK)
Oberstar	Siskis	Young (FL)
Obey	Skaggs	Zimmer
Oliver	Skeen	
Ortiz	Skelton	

NOES—22

Armey	Herger	Royce
Ballenger	Hoekstra	Sensenbrenner
Burton	Hunter	Solomon
Coble	Inglis	Stump
Crane	Paxon	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	Ramstad	Zeliff
Goodling	Roberts	
Hancock	Roth	

NOT VOTING—14

Blackwell	Grandy	Sangmeister
Collins (GA)	Hinchey	Tauzin
Darden	Long	Washington
Doolittle	McCrery	Wheat
Fish	Ridge	

□ 1726

Mr. ROYCE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DICKEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

□ 1730

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3254, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1994

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill (H.R. 3254) to authorize appropriations for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, H.R. 3254.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,

Washington, DC, April 6, 1994.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my Committee staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the Superior Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

E (KIKI) DE LA GARZA,
Chairman.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARLOW). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each:

SIGN THE A TO Z DISCHARGE PETITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the

gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my strong support for the A to Z spending cut plan.

During the debate over the President's budget bill last year many Members found it difficult for a bill that relied too heavily on taxes and too little on spending cuts. They relied on the promises of the leadership that they would have a special spending cut session to address their concerns. However, according to the Congressional Daily of April 21, not only will this not materialize, but we will have instead open opposition from the leadership to any such spending cut proposals. It is a fact that since the budget passed, there have been three strikes and you're out for those of us who believe that it is time to bring our deficit under control.

Strike one. The Penny-Kasich \$91 billion spending cut bill was killed by the House leadership.

Strike two. The balanced budget amendment was killed by the House leadership.

Strike three. The Kasich motion to instruct conferees to cut \$26 billion was killed by the House leadership.

But we do not have to live with three strikes and you're out. Let us give ourselves another swing at the deficit. It is too important a problem to let go by. Everyone should sign on to the A to Z spending cut discharge petition.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote in part from a Review and Outlook published in The Wall Street Journal of May 4, 1994, and I quote in part:

A fundamental disconnect has developed between the public and Congress on budget reform. To Congressional leaders reform means larding on a new health care entitlement. To voters, especially those in the suburbs, cutting spending is more popular than expanding programs that they don't think deliver value for their tax dollars.

Yet House leaders whine about this troublesome pressure for cuts. "There is an intense feeling in the caucus that this is getting out of hand," one Democrat told the Congressional Monitor. "Between The Wall Street Journal, Gingrich and our boil weevils, we're being asked to vote on a budget cut every three months." How awful.

A House majority is on record as supporting A to Z, so voters may want to know who was responsible for presenting such a common-sense idea from reaching the floor for a vote. They may well conclude that Members who praise A to Z in their franked mailings home but then cave in to House leaders on the discharge petition are either hypocrites or political wimps. By now, the public has caught on to the rigged game known as House Rules. If the House doesn't implement some procedures to open up the system for both Democrats and Republican Members, the electorate may decide this November is the time to radically change the makeup of the place.

Mr. Speaker, the deficit is our number one challenge. Our long-term future strength of this country and its health depends on a businesslike solution to the deficit. Time is valuable.

We are wasting time. The problem only gets worse by every passing month in which we continue our deficit spending. It is time we acted now to cut spending and eliminate the unconscionable and unreasonable dissipation of our future financial strength. It is our responsibility and it should not be foisted off on our children to solve our financial problems.

Sign on today to the A to Z proposal so that we can consider in a businesslike fashion the cuts that this House should make in the budget.

□ 1740

HEALTH COVERAGE NEED FOR ALL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARLOW). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STRICKLAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I receive letters from my constituents every week, sometimes hundreds of letters. I would like to share this evening a letter which I received from a young teacher in my district, a letter about his family and their difficulty in attaining adequate health care.

He begins by saying,

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STRICKLAND: I am a teacher, and I am writing because I wanted to relate to you something that has happened to my family. My family has run into a health care concern that I hope underscores the need for the Congress to improve the availability of health care for all Americans.

Then he tells me about his father-in-law. He says,

My father-in-law runs a small business in your district in Ohio. He has raised seven children, including my wife, and he has never been able to afford medical insurance. He is 55 years old, and high blood pressure makes the premiums way beyond his means. His local doctor recently was alarmed at the results of a stress test and told him he was at risk of a heart attack at any time. He was sent to a specialist in Columbus, and he expected to be admitted to the hospital.

Then my constituent in his letter continues. He said,

The first words out of the specialist's mouth were to the effect, to my father and mother-in-law, that they should have insurance. And he quotes, "No insurance, huh? Well, how do you people expect to pay for this treatment? How do you pay for your medication? How do you pay your bills?"

All this was before he even examined my father-in-law's records. Needless to say, both my in-laws were upset by this. The doctor was then going to send him home simply with medication.

My wife returned her father to his local doctor the next morning, and, after explaining what had happened, the local doctor sent him straight to the hospital here in Chillicothe, where he is now in intensive care, awaiting a heart catheterization on Monday morning.

Then the letter continues:

Congressman, I hope you agree with me that the specialist's words and attitude were

unconscionable. He continued to tell my father-in-law that he really didn't need the money, but he was concerned about everyone else that was going to have to pay for this surgery if it was performed.

My father-in-law looked me in the eye and said to me these words: "That doctor made me see how poor I am." For a man in danger of a heart attack to be put through this is frustrating, insulting, and beneath contempt. My father-in-law is not on welfare. He pays his taxes.

My constituent ended his letter in this way: He said,

Congressman Strickland, I hope this letter does more than just act as a release for my frustration and anger. I hope it may help in some small way to open the eyes of those in Washington who see no health care crisis. I know there are many questions concerning President Clinton's plan, but I want to ask that you and all others quickly work together to find a way to bring costs down and make insurance more available.

As a Member of Congress, I cannot receive such letters without feeling a very heavy sense of responsibility. Some 125,000 of the men, women, and children who live in my congressional district have no health insurance tonight. We cannot ignore this situation any longer. To do so will be irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to take this matter seriously, to stop the rhetoric, and to do the hard work that it is going to take to pass a comprehensive health care plan that will provide comprehensive, guaranteed health care coverage for every man, woman and child in this country.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT CHARGES PENDING AGAINST PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to come to the floor today and discuss Rwanda and the genocidal slaughter taking place in that tortured country. Genocide is a word that is overused, but in the case of Rwanda it fits. In fact, both sides in this horrible tribal war are attempting it. It is a tragedy.

Last night, speaking live to an audience in Pennsylvania, it occurred to me that of the six Nazi extermination camps, not labor camps, not concentration camps, like Dachau, Borgen-Belsen, Ravensbruck, Buchenwald, but camps built to exterminate human beings, to eliminate the entire Jewish population of every country in Western and Middle Europe, that of those six extermination camps, only Treblinka, killing 750,000 people, and the horror of Auschwitz and its huge satellite camp of Birkenau, which killed a million and a half or more people, only those two camps out of six, killed more than 500,000 people. It all took 2 or 3 years in

gas chambers and a perversion of science and technology to do it. But in Rwanda, even more people have been killed in 3 weeks, most of them with machetes, than at Chelmo, Belzec, Mydanyck, or Sobibor.

This is an unbelievable slaughter, and I will talk about it next week for an hour. I could also have spoken tonight about Haiti and the inconsistency in our policy which is on the front page of all the papers. Mr. Clinton contradicts himself almost every month now on that policy. Then there is Bosnia, Bosnia, Bosnia. It will not go away. There three peoples are engaged in ethnic slaughter with the Bosnian Serbs the main perpetrators.

But, Mr. Speaker, all of that will have to wait, because in my remaining 3 or 4 minutes tonight, I must discuss this button that I have been wearing all day, I will take it off now, because parliamentary rules say it is a minidemonstration on the floor, which is not allowed.

The button says, "I believe Paula." That does not mean Paula Coughlin, lieutenant senior grade of the terrible Navy Tailhook Scandal in Las Vegas, even though I also believed everything that she said. What has hurt her was day one when she had her upper thigh shaved and wrote on a sign, "You made me see God." That is not average conduct for a Catholic lady in or out of the service. I believed everything she said about the gauntlet and the degrading treatment of lady officers at Tailhook.

The Paula referred to on this button is Paula Corbin Jones. I have known about her story since September of last year, before it went into print in the *American Spectator*.

Mr. Speaker, this is the front page of the *Washington Post*, which by printing the story has redeemed its integrity. It says, "Clinton Hires Lawyers as Sex Harassment Suit Is Threatened."

This former Arkansas State employee, Paula Corbin, now married so she is Paula Corbin Jones, alleges improper advance by then Governor Clinton in 1991, after the presidential campaign was underway. If you recall former Senator Tsongas, a colleague here of us once, had already declared. Others were also declaring. This was 5 months before Mr. Clinton himself declared. It was May 8, 1991.

And Mr. Speaker, this Paula Corbin Jones case makes the charges against a Member of the other body involving 12, up to 30 instances of sexual harassment pale in comparison. It makes the Anita Hill story pale in comparison. It makes Paul Coughlin's story at Las Vegas pale.

After you leave the front page with these two stories written principally by Michael Isikoff, who was suspended in a fight over this story, you go inside to discover it fills the entire 14th page. This is one of the three biggest papers in the country, along with the New

York Times and the Los Angeles Times.

□ 1750

There is not an advertisement on it. I am going to ask to put these two stories in the *RECORD*.

This is what they call, in the mass media, "a fire storm."

Tomorrow the L.A. Times and all of the other big papers will pick up the wire service stories on Paula Corbin Jones' charges of the grossest sort of sexual harassment against the now sitting President who was then the sitting Governor of Arkansas.

Then she will file the case tomorrow, which will be in all the papers on Friday, coast-to-coast. I understand it is the major topic of conversation on every talk show, whether the host is liberal or conservative or a raging moderate, all across the country. And the President has hired Bob Bennett, who is the lawyer of one of our colleagues, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

I just want to end by reminding my colleagues what I said back in the fall of 1992. I said if the country elected Bill Clinton all sorts of stories about sex and other unsavory aspects of Mr. Clinton's past would come pouring out. I was ridiculed at the time. Well, I hate to be an "I told you so," but, well, I told you so. I take little satisfaction in being right, however, because this President is ripping the moral fiber of our country to shreds. What must the children of America be thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the *RECORD* the articles to which I referred.

[From the *Washington Post*, May 4, 1994]

CLINTON HIRES LAWYER AS SEX HARASSMENT SUIT IS THREATENED

FORMER STATE EMPLOYEE IN ARKANSAS ALLEGES IMPROPER ADVANCE IN 1991

(By Michael Isikoff; Charles E. Shepard, and Sharon LaFraniere)

On Feb. 11, former Arkansas state clerical worker Paula Jones appeared at a Washington news conference and accused Bill Clinton of making an unwanted and improper sexual advance during a brief encounter in a Little Rock hotel room in 1991.

As Jones told it, a state trooper serving on then-Gov. Clinton's security detail summoned her to meet Clinton while she was working at a state-sponsored conference where he was speaking. Alone with her, Jones said, Clinton tried to kiss her, reached under her clothing and asked her to perform a sexual act. She said she felt humiliated and walked out within minutes.

Asked by reporters to respond, White House aides said the story was untrue and described it as a cheap political trick engineered by avowed Clinton enemy Cliff Jackson, who had helped arrange Jones' news conference at a gathering of political conservatives. They said Clinton had no memory of meeting the woman.

Clinton's new attorney, Robert S. Bennett, said yesterday, "This event, plain and simple, didn't happen." Clinton has retained Bennett as his personal attorney to defend against a threatened lawsuit by Jones.

Over the past three months, The Washington Post has interviewed Jones extensively

about what she said happened in Little Rock's Excelsior Hotel. She said she was alone with Clinton in the room—making it impossible to independently resolve what, if anything, happened between them.

Jones, who now lives in California, provided the names of two longtime friends and two family members who said in interviews that Jones had told them about the May 8, 1991, episode the day it occurred. One of the friends, a co-worker at the conference, said she witnessed the trooper's approach. Jones's then-boyfriend, Steve Jones, now her husband, said she told him at the time that Clinton had made a pass at her.

Three Arkansas state troopers have said in published accounts and in recent interviews with the Post that Clinton used them and other members of his state security detail to solicit women to whom he was attracted, although none was on duty on the day Jones alleges she met with Clinton.

Key aspects of Jones' account are a departure from past allegations about Clinton's personal conduct. Jones worked for an Arkansas state agency, and she contends that Clinton's conduct toward her constituted sexual harassment of an employee. No woman has ever publicly accused Clinton of workplace harassment or the extreme behavior that Jones recounts.

"What she alleges is simply inconceivable as Clinton behavior," said Betsey Wright, Clinton's former chief of staff in Arkansas who helped his 1992 presidential campaign combat allegations of extramarital affairs.

Aides to Clinton have suggested that, aside from political motivation, Jones could be seeking financial gain, and her attorney has acknowledged that before her news conference he made an effort to negotiate an out-of-court monetary settlement in exchange for her silence. Yesterday Bennett accused Jones's attorney of seeking a job for Jones in return for her silence.

The first account of a story involving Paula Jones appeared in the January issue of the conservative *American Spectator* magazine. The article quoted an unnamed trooper who said he approached a woman named "Paula" on Clinton's behalf, then stood guard outside a hotel room while Clinton met with her. The trooper said in the account that she told him, as she left the room after less than an hour, that she was willing to be Clinton's girlfriend.

The trooper, later identified as Danny Ferguson, has refused since Jones's news conference to discuss the *American Spectator* article. He declined again last week to be interviewed.

Jones has said it was indignation over that article and what she said was the untrue depiction of her encounter with Clinton that caused her to speak out. Her attorney, Daniel Traylor of Little Rock, said Jones had to go public because Clinton indirectly had declined private appeals Traylor made for a public clarification of the *American Spectator* story. Traylor later confirmed that he did not know whether such an appeal had actually reached the White House.

Jones's allegations revolve around the 1991 Governor's Quality Conference, a one-day session on management for manufacturing executives and government officials held at the 19-story Excelsior Hotel at the edge of downtown Little Rock.

Then 44, Clinton was in his fifth term as governor. Already considered a possible Democratic candidate for the presidency, he had just returned from a well-received appearance before the national Democratic Leadership Council. He was five months from announcing his candidacy.

At the registration desk outside the hotel ballroom, Jones (then Paula Corbin) and a coworker she had known since childhood, Pam Blackard, were handing out name tags and literature. Jones, then 24, had been hired two months earlier as a \$10,270-a-year clerk for the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, a job that required regular visits to the governor's office in the capitol. The job was the highlight of her resume: After secretarial classes at a junior college, she had held a string of office and sales positions, none for more than nine months.

Jones described herself in interviews as sometimes too trusting and a talkative and outgoing person. "A lot of people take that as being a flirt," she said. "That's just me though. I like people, and I like to talk to people. . . . It doesn't matter if it's a man or woman."

At some point during the day of the conference, Jones said, she noticed Clinton standing nearby, answering questions from reporters. Jones, who had never met Clinton, said she thought he was staring at her. A few minutes later, she said trooper Ferguson, a member of Clinton's security detail with whom she had chatted earlier, approached the table and told her, "The governor said you make his knees knock."

She said Ferguson returned a short time later, at about 2:30, and handed her a piece of paper with a room number written on it. "The governor would like to meet you up in his room and talk to you . . . in a few minutes," Ferguson said.

Jones said she had recognized the suggestive flavor of Ferguson's "knees knock" comment, but reacted to his words as a compliment, not a come-on. She said she had no reason to expect what she said happened later. "I was brought up to trust people and especially of that stature—you know, a governor," Jones said she hoped the meeting might yield a better-paying job in Clinton's office.

Clinton's schedule for that day, provided by the White House last week after repeated requests, shows the governor scheduled for "phone time" between 2:15 and 2:30 that afternoon after a luncheon and videotaping at the governor's mansion.

The schedule indicates Clinton had the option of returning to the quality conference between 2:30 and 4 p.m. Conference organizers had asked Clinton to attend as much of the day as possible.

After Jones's news conference, a White House aide said her account could not be true and referred The Post to Phil Price, Gov. Clinton's senior assistant for economic development in 1991 and now Arkansas' assistant bank commissioner. Price said he is convinced Clinton did not return to the Excelsior that afternoon because he does not remember returning himself and he was Clinton's designated staff member for such conferences. But management consultant James Harrington, the featured conference speaker after lunch, said he talked to and saw Clinton that afternoon. "He was milling about, meeting people, saying hello," he said.

Jones said she followed Ferguson upstairs, and the trooper stayed in the hallway. Clinton met her at the door, she said. She said the room was furnished as a parlor and had no bed.

After asking her about her job, she said, Clinton took her hand. She said, she pulled it away, and tried to distract him by chatting about Clinton's wife. But, she said, he persisted, kissing her neck and putting his hand on her thigh underneath her culotte.

Jones said she objected, asking Clinton: "What's going on?" She said he told her he

had noticed her downstairs and liked the curves of her body and the way her black hair flowed down her back. "I will never forget the look on his face," she said. "His face was just red, beet red."

Asked why she didn't leave the room, she said: "I guess I didn't know what to do. This is the governor, this is not just anyone. I feel intimidated . . . by anybody that's higher than me. I feel I've got to do everything possible not to make them upset at me. I've always been like that."

Jones said she walked to the far end of a sofa and sat down, averting her eyes. The next thing she knew, she said, Clinton had dropped his trousers and underwear and was sitting next to her on the couch. Then, she said, he asked her to perform oral sex.

"I jumped up and I said, 'No, I don't do that. I'm not that type of person. I need to be going back downstairs,'" Jones recalled saying. Clinton, she said, tried to reassure her that she would not be in trouble with her boss if she stayed, but she left the room. As she was leaving, she said, Clinton asked her not to mention the episode to anyone.

She said she passed Ferguson in the hallway without speaking, and returned to the table where Blackard still sat downstairs. She estimated she had been gone for no more than 15 minutes.

In an interview, Blackard said she had seen Clinton staring at Jones, watched the trooper ask Jones to meet Clinton, and talked with her about whether to go. "I did say to her . . . 'Find out what he wants and come right back. . . . If you're that curious, go ahead,'" Blackard recalled saying.

When she returned, Blackard said, Jones was "walking fast" and "shaking." She said Jones told her that Clinton had made unwanted advances and Jones implored her to tell no one. "We were both kind of scared," Blackard recalled. "We weren't thinking straight. I thought I could lose my job. She thought she could lose her job."

In an interview, Jones said that at the time she feared she would be fired for leaving the registration desk or because her refusal might have angered Clinton, who as governor appointed her boss.

Another friend, Debra Ballentine, said Jones showed up unexpectedly at her office late that afternoon and told her the story. Jones trembled and "was breathing really hard," said Ballentine, who has known Jones about six years and is a marketing coordinator for a large Little Rock company. Ballentine said Jones "couldn't believe she was so stupid" for going upstairs.

Before Jones's news conference, both Ballentine and Blackard signed affidavits supporting Jones's account after conferences in the office of Jones's attorney, Traylor. The Post interviewed both women subsequently.

Jones's two sisters said they talked to Jones that evening at their homes outside Little Rock. Charlotte Brown said her younger sister told her in a "matter of fact" way that Clinton had propositioned her. Lydia Cathey, now 29 and closer in age to Jones, said she ushered her sister into her bedroom, shut the door and comforted her sister as she cried on the bed.

One voice silent in the Paula Jones controversy is that of trooper Ferguson, who now guards Clinton's successor in the Arkansas governor's mansion, Jim Guy Tucker (D).

"I am not going to say anything about it," Ferguson told The Post after Jones's February news conference. "I have to think about my family."

Other troopers said Ferguson told them about soliciting a woman at the Excelsior

soon afterward and again last summer, when he and three other members of the Arkansas governor's security detail began talking among themselves about experiences with Clinton, including times they say they had sought out women on the governor's behalf.

One story Ferguson told involved a woman named "Paula," according to the troopers. Trooper Roger Perry told The Post he heard Ferguson tell how Clinton had noticed "Paula" at the Excelsior and had described her as having "that come-hither look." Perry said in an interview that Ferguson, at Clinton's request, arranged to get a room, telling the hotel Clinton expected a call from the White House.

Last summer several of the troopers, looking for a book deal, enlisted the help of Little Rock attorney Cliff Jackson, who has worked for years to discredit Clinton politically. Eager to get maximum impact, he arranged for the troopers to talk to reporters for the American Spectator magazine and the Los Angeles Times.

The Spectator article, released in late December, quoted an unidentified trooper as saying that he had recruited "Paula" at Clinton's request and stood guard outside the hotel room for "no more than an hour." The magazine also reported that the trooper recalled "Paula" saying as she exited that "she was available to be Clinton's regular girlfriend if he so desired"—a remark at odds with Jones's story. Fellow troopers told The Post that Ferguson had told them "Paula" was willing to be Clinton's girlfriend.

Jones said she learned about the Spectator article from her friend Ballentine during a visit to Arkansas last January. Jones said she felt humiliated by the magazine's description of her encounter with Clinton and believed that some of her friends and family would conclude that she was the "Paula" described in the article. She said she wanted to "clear my name."

Jones said she did not accuse Clinton during the 1992 campaign, when his conduct with women was at issue, because she still worked for the state and was convinced no one would believe her.

The day after Jones said she learned about the American Spectator article, Jones and Ballentine recalled they ran into Ferguson at a restaurant in the Little Rock area. Jones said she asked Ferguson if he had been the magazine's source. Ferguson became apologetic according to both Jones and Ballentine.

According to the two women, Ferguson said he had been dragged into the interview with the Spectator by the other troopers. They said he added that no one would know who Jones was because he hadn't disclosed her last name and, "besides, Clinton told me you wouldn't do anything anyway."

Jones said she had several more contacts with Ferguson and Clinton before she left her state job in February 1993. Once, she said, she ran into Ferguson, who told her Clinton had been asking about her, wanted her home phone number and was interested in seeing her. Jones, who was living with the man she would marry in December 1991, said she refused.

Jones saw Clinton two more times before she left the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, she said. Once she got a brief hello. The other time, in fall 1991, she said, Clinton called out to her under the rotunda of the Arkansas capitol. He was accompanied by another bodyguard, Larry Patterson, one of the three troopers who has publicly accused Clinton of womanizing. Patterson said in an interview he recalls the encounter as Jones does.

After Clinton spotted her, Jones said, Clinton called out her name and walked over. Then, she said, "he squeezed me up close to him," her side to his. He turned with a smile to Patterson, his arm still around her shoulder and said to Patterson: "Don't we make a beautiful couple? Beauty and the Beast."

She said she replied, "Well, you don't look like the Beast." And with that, she said, Clinton bid goodbye, saying, "It was nice to see you, 'Paula.'"

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1994]

BENNETT SETS AN AGGRESSIVE CAMPAIGN ON PUBLIC RELATIONS AND LEGAL FRONTS

(By Michael Isikoff)

President Clinton has retained prominent Washington defense lawyer Robert S. Bennett as part of an aggressive public relations and legal strategy aimed at fighting allegations from a former Arkansas state employee that Clinton sexually harassed her three years ago.

An attorney for Paula Corbin Jones said yesterday she intends to file a civil suit in federal court on Thursday accusing Clinton of violating her civil rights and causing her "severe emotional distress" by making "unwelcome physical contact" and asking her to perform a sexual act. The three-year statute of limitations on these claims is to expire at the end of this week.

White House officials have denied Jones's allegations. This week, believing Jones will make good on her intentions to file suit, Clinton and White House counsel Lloyd Cutler turned over the defense to Bennett, well known for his spirited representation of prominent Washington clients, and gave him new authority to mount a public relations counteroffensive, knowledgeable sources said.

"Bennett is . . . savvy about both the law as well as the ways of Washington and the press," said one White House official. "He brings a lot of assets to this type of case."

Bennett said in an interview yesterday that the lawsuit was "really just an attempt to rewrite the results of the election" and released an affidavit from a Little Rock businessman saying that Jones's lawyer, Daniel Traylor, threatened to publicly "embarrass" Clinton last January unless his client got money. Traylor also said that "it would help if President Clinton would get Paula a job out in California," according to the businessman's sworn statement.

Bennett becomes the second Washington lawyer hired by the president to deal with controversies about Clinton's private life and investments. David Kendall has been dealing with the investigation of special counsel Robert B. Fiske Jr. about Bill and Hillary Rodham Clinton's investment in the Whitewater Development Corp. and its ties to a failed Arkansas savings and loan, Madison Guaranty. Kendall has also been monitoring negotiations on Capitol Hill over the shape and timing of congressional hearings on the matter.

"Bennett obviously has had considerable experience with congressional hearings and I would expect he would be involved in giving advice on those kinds of things," said one senior administration official.

Bennett was counsel to the Senate ethics committee in its investigation of the "Keating Five" senators. He represented Clark Clifford in the BCCI investigation, and is Rep. Dan Rostenkowski's lawyer in the Justice Department's investigation of the Illinois Democrat.

The White House said both Kendall and Bennett are being paid with the Clinton's private funds.

Bennett is known as a lawyer who not only fights behind the scenes for his clients but also is an outspoken public advocate. "there's a sense that a lot of this was political and needed to be fought on a more public level," one source said.

Jones's charges have been a cause celebre in right-wing circles since she first appeared last Feb. 11 at a news conference organized by Cliff Jackson, a Little Rock lawyer who is a longtime political opponent of Clinton's and sponsored by the Conservative Political Action Committee. Jackson had called reporters to attend the launch of a fund-raising effort for Arkansas state troopers who had accused Clinton of abusing his office as governor to solicit women for him.

Charges that Clinton had engaged in extramarital liaisons arose during the presidential campaign, when he was publicly accused by an Arkansas woman, Gennifer Flowers, of having conducted a years-long affair with her and then obtaining for her a state job. Clinton said her story was untrue, but confessed to having caused "pain in my marriage." The matter was largely dropped as other issues came to dominate the campaign.

It arose again in December, when a conservative magazine, the American Spectator, published the allegations by the state troopers.

The mainstream media largely gave limited coverage to Jones's allegations, leading several publications and interest groups to publicly accuse them of covering up for Clinton, and to insist that her charges be afforded the same attention as the sexual harassment allegations Anita F. Hill made during the Senate confirmation hearings of Clarence Thomas for the Supreme Court.

Last month, the conservative watchdog group Accuracy in Media ran advertisements in The Washington Post and the New York Times criticizing them for ignoring the story.

Republicans have concentrated their anti-Clinton fire on the Whitewater investigation of land deals by Clinton and his wife in Arkansas, rather than allegations by Jones or the troopers.

Jones has said that while working at a state government conference on May 8, 1991, she was approached by Arkansas state trooper Daniel Ferguson and was asked to meet Clinton in an upstairs room. Once inside, she said, Clinton made unwelcome sexual advances.

Traylor said that the suit will charge that Clinton had a regular "practice" of using state troopers to approach women for sex with him and that he also will seek testimony from the troopers.

"Paula Jones is a victim of that practice," Traylor said.

Bennett said the lawsuit Traylor is contemplating is "unprecedented" and he questioned whether a president may be sued for alleged events that took place before he entered office.

Jones has said she did not file her claims after they happened because she was frightened she would lose her state job if she accused the governor of misconduct. Because federal law requires that sexual harassment claims be filed within 180 days of the alleged offense, Jones long since missed her chance to do so.

But Traylor said he intends to make a variety of other legal claims against the president, including intentional infliction of emotional distress, and civil rights violations, based on the allegations that state troopers targeted women. Both of those claims have a three-year statute of limitations.

Traylor, a sole practitioner with little trial experience, said he reached out to prominent trial lawyers around the country as well as feminist groups and others for help in handling Jones's case, only to be turned down.

Traylor said he was set to file the complaint last Friday on his own when he received a last minute fax from the conservative Landmark Legal Foundation, asking him to hold off because it had just recruited an experienced litigation firm that could help him.

But Traylor said that that offer never materialized and he has since found another experienced trial lawyer, whom he declined to identify, to assist him in the case.

Yesterday, Bennett focused his attacks on Traylor's conduct. Traylor said in interviews earlier this year that he had tried before Jones's news conference to relay a message to the White House through a Little Rock businessman, George L. Cook, that his client was willing to say nothing publicly in return for an apology from Clinton and money to compensate for the harm she claims Clinton did.

In the affidavit released yesterday by Bennett, Cook said Traylor had told him that if Jones didn't get money for her claim, "she would embarrass him publicly."

Cook states in the affidavit that he asked Traylor during their January meeting why he had taken the Jones case. "He said he knew his case was weak, but he needed the client and he needed the money. . . . Traylor said it would help if President Clinton would get Paula a job out in California [where she now lives]. I told Traylor that would be illegal." Cook said he decided on his own not to relay Traylor's message to the White House.

Traylor acknowledged yesterday that he suggested a variety of possible ways to settle the case out of court, including arranging jobs for Jones and her husband, an airline ticket agent and aspiring actor, as well as a public apology from Clinton. Traylor said he told Cook: "Bill's got lots of Hollywood contacts."

But Traylor insisted there was nothing improper about the discussions and that Jones had never suggested that he seek a job for her or money from the president. "She ain't in it for the money," Traylor said. Traylor said he regrets "contaminating" Jones's allegations by the involvement with Jackson, Clinton's longtime political enemy. Traylor said he contacted Jackson thinking mistakenly that Jackson was representing trooper Ferguson, the source for the Spectator article that named "Paula."

That connection prompted Clinton senior adviser George Stephanopoulos to call Jones's allegation "a cheap political fund-raising trick."

PROOF OF THE CALIFORNIA ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN'S EFFECTIVENESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following letter to Chairman SCHUMER in the RECORD.

As it explains, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms has recently provided preliminary statistics documenting the success of California's Roberti-Roos Assault Weapons Control Act of 1989.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 25, 1994.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Crime, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the Subcommittee on Crime begins its consideration of H.R. 3527, the Public Safety and Recreational Firearms Use Protection Act, I urge you to look at the effects of the nation's oldest assault weapons ban, California's Roberti-Roos Assault Weapons Control Act of 1989.

This legislation went into effect on July 1, 1989. It was passed in the aftermath of Patrick Purdy's shooting spree at a schoolyard in Stockton, California. Armed with an AK-47 and several semiautomatic pistols, Purdy fired over 100 rounds killing five school children and wounding thirty others before killing himself.

Now, five years after the passage of this law, I think we can begin to evaluate the law's effectiveness. At my request, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF) has provided some preliminary data from the National Tracing Center. These numbers reflect requests to the ARF by local law enforcement agencies for background traces conducted on guns which are suspected to have been used in crimes. Although this data does have limitations and is not a direct measurement of criminal use, the Congressional Research Service has pointed out this data is, "the only significant national data on the makes and models of firearms that may have been used in crimes."

The data shows that although the California law has not ended criminal use of assault weapons in California, it has significantly helped California's law enforcement officials contain assault weapons' growing popularity among criminals.

ASSAULT WEAPONS IN CALIFORNIA VS. THE NATION

Over the past three years, both California and the nation have experienced growing criminal use of assault weapons, as evidenced by increasing requests for ATF traces. However, while national requests have skyrocketed, California's requests have grown at a much slower rate and stabilized for some of the most criminally popular weapons.

Following the 1986 Machine Gun Ban and President Bush's 1989 Assault Weapons Import Ban, trace requests for assault weapons (as determined by ATF) decreased nationally, both in number and proportion. Starting in 1991, however, they have risen and, based on the first three months of 1994, will easily surpass the 1989 level (see tables 1 and 2).

During the same period, however, California's local law enforcement requested far fewer traces of the forty-plus weapons banned by the Roberti-Roos law. In fact, while trace requests for assault weapons rose nationally by 52% between 1991 and 1993, California requests for banned guns increased less than half that rate—22% (see table 3). Additionally, California's trace requests for the banned guns decreased as a proportion of the national total—from 7.1% in 1991 to 5.7% in 1993. Clearly, the California ban has spared California from the drastic national growth.

As for the legislation you are considering, the guns explicitly banned by H.R. 3527 make up 85% of all assault weapons traced by ATF for criminal activity during the past three years. From 1991 through 1993, trace requests for these guns have risen 62%.

Trace requests for certain weapons whose criminal use has skyrocketed nation-wide also show California's stability. For example, while trace requests for AK-47s have almost tripled nationally, they have remained the same in California (table 4).

However, California trace requests for another popular assault weapon not banned by the California law, the TEC 22, have essentially mirrored the national growth rate: 100% in CA from 1991 to 1993 compared to 116% nationally.

ASSAULT WEAPONS IN CA: BANNED VS. LEGAL

Looking at trace requests within California reveals other important trends. Although California has stabilized the growth of the guns which it has banned, there has been significant growth in California's trace requests for guns which were left out of the ban or which did not exist in 1989.

California's assault weapons ban has experienced problems with new weapons because it bans weapon names rather than weapon features. Both the San Jose Mercury News and The Los Angeles Times have reported that, "designing similar but not identical guns to those on the prohibited list has become common for gun manufacturers looking to get around the California law" (San Jose Mercury News, 7/3/93). Even though the law gave the state Attorney General the power to add guns to the list, none have been added since 1989. As a result, there has been a boom in new, legal, assault weapons with features identical to banned guns, but with new names.

The TEC 9 family of guns manufactured by Intratec, shows both the increased criminal preference for legal assault weapons as well as growing popularity in copy-cat designed to get around the ban. The Roberti-Roos Assault Weapons Ban specifically banned the TEC 9 but did not mention the substantially similar TEC 22. As a result, California's trace requests for the TEC 9 have slightly declined, while those for the TEC 22 have doubled (see table 5).

This family of guns also shows the ominous dangers of the copy-cat loophole. On July 1, 1993 Gian Ferri walked into the San Francisco law offices of Pettit & Martin carrying two TEC DC9 semi-automatic assault pistols. With them he shot and killed eight people before taking his own life. The TEC DC 9, functionally identical and look-alike to the TEC 9, was created shortly after the passage of the California law to be sold as a legal version of the TEC 9. Not surprisingly, California trace requests for TEC DC9s have shot up while requests for TEC9s have fallen (see table 5).

The Public Safety and Recreational Firearms Use Protection Act (H.R. 3527), which you are presently considering, would close this gaping loophole by including language to ban assault weapon by feature rather than name. Since this features-based assault weapons ban focuses on military features, it protects the rights of legitimate hunters and sportsmen. The appendix listing over 600 le-

gitimate hunting and sporting guns (including over 60 semiautomatic rifles) would also be an important fail-safe guarantee of hunters' rights.

WOULD A NATIONAL BAN WORK?

Some skeptics have asked whether a national assault weapons ban could work. We already have one that does.

ATF tracing statistics show that President Bush's 1989 Assault Weapons Import Ban has significantly reduced the use of the models it banned over the past three years (see table 6). Trace requests for illegally-used guns banned by President Bush's 1989 Import Ban declined nationally by 16% between 1991-1993. Both California and the nation have benefited from the reduced misuse of these guns.

I hope you will find this information helpful as you consider the Public Safety and Recreational Firearms Use Protection Act. I enthusiastically support it, and hope you will report the bill as it passed the Senate. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me at (202) 225-5065.

Sincerely,

PETE STARK,
Member of Congress.

TABLE 1.—U.S. ASSAULT WEAPONS TRACE REQUESTS ARE RISING

	All ATF traces	Traces of assault weapons
1986	39,800	2,755
1987	35,100	2,296
1988	37,050	3,977
1989	41,807	4,163
1990	47,770	2,808
1991	53,924	2,991
1992	50,533	3,254
1993	55,665	4,532
1994—projected	60,672	6,332

Table 2.—Assault weapons are also rising as percent of traces

	Percent
1986	6.9
1987	6.5
1988	10.7
1989	10.0
1990	5.9
1991	5.5
1992	6.4
1993	8.1
1994—projected	10.4

Table 3.—California trace requests for weapons banned in 1989 by Roberti-Roos law

1986	246
1987	170
1988	279
1989	290
1990	318
1991	213
1992	235
1993	260

TABLE 4.—GROWTH IN AK-47 TRACES

	AK-47 traces—	
	California	United States
1991	25	336
1992	21	424
1993	28	934

TABLE 5.—TEC 9 FAMILY OF GUNS IN CALIFORNIA

	TEC 9 banned		TEC-DC9 copy cat—legal		TEC 22 legal	
	California	United States	California	United States	California	United States
1991	20	771			4	98
1992	25	640	1	111	5	134

TABLE 5.—TEC 9 FAMILY OF GUNS IN CALIFORNIA—Continued

	TEC 9 banned		TEC-DC9 copy cat—legal		TEC 22 legal	
	California	United States	California	United States	California	United States
1993	16	617	24	454	8	212
Percent of growth 1991–1993	–20	–20			100	116

Table 6.—Decline in trace requests for assault weapons banned by 1989 import ban

	Traces
1991	1028
1992	893
1993 ¹	862

¹ From 1991 to 1993 traces declined 16 percent.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 7 p.m.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 7 p.m.

□ 1904

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY) at 7 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4296, PUBLIC SAFETY AND RECREATIONAL FIREARMS USE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–492) on the resolution (H. Res. 416) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4296) to make unlawful the transfer or possession of assault weapons, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY S. 636, FREEDOM OF ACCESS TO CLINIC ENTRANCES ACT OF 1994

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–493) on the resolution (H. Res. 417) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 636) to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit individuals to have freedom of access to certain medical clinics and facilities, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 218, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–494) on the resolution (H. Res. 418) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, and providing that rule XLIX shall not apply with respect to the adoption of that conference report, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

OXFORD STYLE DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will again, as it did on March 16, 1994, conduct a structured debate on a mutually agreed upon subject. A member recognized by the Chair and holding the floor as moderator will yield time to eight Members, four from the majority party and four from the minority party.

The primary purpose of this debate is to enhance the quality of the deliberative process of the House of Representatives, so as to enable all Members to be better informed and to participate in subsequent debates and decisions on major issues.

Under the previous orders of February 11 and March 11, 1994, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will be recognized to moderate a structured debate in the format and sequence that he will describe, which has been mutually established by the majority and minority leaders.

The rules of the House with respect to decorum and proper forms of address to the Chair will apply during this debate. The moderator will yield time to the participants, and will insist that members not interrupt on other Members' time. As part of the experiment—and not as a precedent for other proceedings of the House—the moderator and the participants will have the aid of a visual timing device.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for up to 2 hours.

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. WALKER. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, as you have indicated, this is the second in a series of Oxford-style debates instituted in the House of Representatives. The first debate was on health care. Tonight we will be debating the issue of welfare. The specific resolve clause for tonight is "Resolved, welfare has done more harm than good." The Republican team will speak in favor of that resolve clause. The Democratic team will speak against that resolve clause.

The format we will use differs slightly from the traditional Oxford debate. After this introduction of the debate topic, one member from each team will make a 3-minute opening statement to present their position. Then we will hear alternately from the teams, with time and recognition controlled by the moderator. It is during this time that the remaining six debaters will have 1½ minutes to make statements, as well as 4 minutes in which to question and later to be questioned by a member of the opposing team or by the entire team.

During the questioning periods of the debate, we would hope that debaters will keep their questions to approximately 30 seconds, and that respondents will keep their answers to approximately 1½ minutes, so we might fit two questions and answers into each 4-minute segment. After the back and forth debate, one member of each team will be recognized for a final summary statement.

For the assistance of the debaters this evening, we have cards that will give members notice when there is certain time remaining in their segment. We hope to have as much give and take as possible during this debate without speaking over one another. If we do not speak over one another, it will keep the moderator from getting confused, and the moderator will much appreciate that. So please be courteous. We would hope to have a vigorous debate on the resolve clause, which again is, "Welfare has done more harm than good."

The debaters for this evening, from the Republican team, are the captain of the team, TOM DELAY of the 22d District of Texas; GARY FRANKS of the Fifth District of Connecticut; CLAY SHAW of the 22d District of Florida; and SUSAN MOLINARI of the 13th District of New York;

Democratic Members participating in tonight's debate are the captain, MIKE SYNAR of the Second District of Oklahoma; LYNN WOOLSEY of the Six District of California; ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the Delegate from Washington

DC; and DAVE MCCURDY of the Fourth District of Oklahoma.

To open the debate tonight, we will ask the captain of the Republican team [Mr. DELAY of Texas] to speak for the resolution for 3 minutes.

□ 1910

Mr. DELAY. Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

The major problem with welfare is that Congress has long been dominated by soft-thinking liberals who believe they help people by giving them things other citizens must earn. Welfare started innocently enough in 1935 with cash assistance for single mothers with children.

President Roosevelt understood that by giving welfare, the policymakers were playing with fire. During debate on the Social Security Act of 1935, he said,

The lessons of history show conclusively that continued dependence on welfare induces a spiritual and moral disintegration, fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out welfare in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit.

Congress ignored Roosevelt's wise advice, and now we have created a 1,000-tentacled monster that must be attacked. We give away cash, food, health care, housing, and social services on the simple conditions that recipients promise not to work and not to marry.

We demand virtually nothing in return. The harms caused by this system are immense. Welfare creates incentives not to work, thereby causing and spreading the dread disease of dependency that Roosevelt warned us about.

Welfare creates incentives not to marry so our divorce rates now reach 50 percent. Welfare creates incentives to have children born out of wedlock so 7 of 10 black children and 2 of 10 white children are now born illegitimately.

Welfare is a key factor in creating some of the world's most devastated and dangerous neighborhoods. Welfare spending grows like a cancer, imperiling the budgets of both the Federal and State Governments. We now spend over \$340 billion in welfare programs.

Let us be clear on this issue. We, as Republicans, do not condemn all welfare programs. Our position is not that welfare has done no good. Rather, our position is that welfare has done more harm than good.

If a car breaks, do you banish it to the junk yard? No. You repair it. And if the problem is a flaw in the car's basic design, you make major alternations in its basic features.

That is what Republicans want to do with welfare. During this debate, we will outline the major changes we want to make in welfare.

Our guiding metaphor is that welfare is like chemotherapy: A little bit can get you back on your feet; too much can damage you.

In this case, as Roosevelt warned, it will damage your soul and that of your children.

Mr. WALKER. The moderator will now recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR] to speak against the resolution for 3 minutes.

Mr. SYNAR. Good evening.

Tonight the Democrats will not defend the status quo. Democrats believe that welfare must and is being changed to encourage marriage, reward work, strengthen families. Welfare ought to be a bridge to new opportunities, not a parking lot. Our reforms stress work, demand responsibility from fathers, and place tough expectations on young unwed mothers.

But you know, too often in these debates we let the myths and our prejudices about welfare cloud the facts. Some of them are true, but many of them are not. Tonight, once and for all, let us set the record straight.

Fact No. 1, over two-thirds of all welfare recipients are children, with an average age of 7 years old. Nearly 14 million children, our Nation's future, live in poverty without hope this very night.

Fact No. 2, the faces of a family on welfare look a lot like yours and mine. The vast majority of people on welfare have one to two children, live in private homes, leave the welfare system within 2 years, and are as likely to be white as black.

Fact No. 3, no one gets rich on welfare. The average welfare benefit in this country is \$367 for a family of three. And Federal spending for welfare is less than 1 percent of our general spending each year.

The Democrats recognize that the current welfare system must be reshaped in order to move people from poverty to work. However, we reject the proposition that welfare has done more harm than good.

Tonight we will present an outstanding example of its success, a mother who used welfare to stabilize her family and move herself forward, all the way to the U.S. Congress.

Democrats believe reform began last year when we enacted legislation that granted tax relief to working poor families and passed legislation so that a mother would not lose her job in order to take care of a sick child. We also believe more needs to be done, providing affordable health care, developing quality child care, and creating stable, good-paying jobs.

These are commitments Democrats have to working people. It has been said that the real measure of a great people is how they treat the least among them. Tonight we find out what that measure is.

Mr. WALKER. The moderator will now recognize the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS] to speak for the opening statement.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

In many ways, welfare is the 20th century's version of slavery. It is reserved for those who are in the worst possible socioeconomic position.

Its victims are dependent on the very system that enslaves them. Its victims receive shelter, food, health care, and clothing from the system. The plantation, as a residence, and the often-used public housing units of today, both leave its victims feeling trapped. Welfare enslaves its victims from sharing the American dream of ownership, prosperity, and hope. Its slave owners or overseers flourish at the expense of its victims. It thrives largely due to a divided family unit.

During slavery, the family was divided via the slave trade business. Today welfare fails to hold the male accountable and inadvertently does its best to push the male out of the house.

Lack of education and hope are two other common denominators between welfare and slavery. Without either, one cannot progress.

We have babies in poverty having babies, thus our current system has produced generations of welfare-dependent children. Our welfare system continues to play the role of the fish delivery man for able-bodied people. Instead, we should help and insist that able-bodied people should catch their own fish.

Eliminating dependency ultimately makes one stronger.

Mr. WALKER. The Chair will now recognize the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] speaking against the opening statement for 1½ minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. My knowledge of welfare is based on experience, my experience as a single working mother with three small children needing welfare in order for my family to survive. That was 25 years ago.

But even today, my face is the face of a typical welfare mother. I am white. I had three children. I was on welfare for 3 years, when my marriage broke up and left my family without child support and without health care.

There are many faces on welfare families, but the thing we have in common is that we need a safety net for our children. We are a people who have worked, paid taxes, and cannot find a job that we can afford to live on.

We are people who need training, who need health care, who need good child care in order to go to work.

We are a people who are poor, because we are divorced or deserted or left without child support.

The welfare system is broken. There is no question about it. But we will not fix it until we have jobs that pay a family wage, until we have health care, until we have a child support system and until we have a child care system for our working families.

Most of all, we have to hold both parents responsible for supporting their children. It comes down to this: We either punish innocent children for being

poor, or we invest in them so that they can get off of welfare once and for all like my family did.

□ 1920

Mr. WALKER. The moderator will now recognize Mr. FRANKS for 4 minutes to question Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Moderator, the intent of welfare was to serve as a temporary safety net to help people get back on their feet, yes. However, it has gone off course considerably. In my opening statement I compared welfare to slavery. We can all agree that slavery was a horrible period in our history, and it was right for us to end slavery.

Welfare versus slavery, slaves were brought here against their will, the intents were different, slaves were black, for the most part, and slaves worked. Could you point out other differences between slavery and welfare?

Ms. WOOLSEY. What I will point out is the safety net of welfare, and what we need to change, so we will not keep welfare recipients, particularly single mothers, on welfare for the long term. That is by investing in the short term for long-term results, and by not treating our welfare recipients as slaves, not trapping them in a system, providing them with the skills and the knowledge they need for the jobs of the future, jobs that pay a family wage.

Do you know that 18 percent of working families in this Nation today with a family of four live below the poverty level?

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. You did not answer my question. My question would be, could you point out some of the differences.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I don't agree that welfare and slavery are the same thing, Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Could you point out the difference between welfare and slavery?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I do not see welfare and slavery the same. That is your thesis, and not mine.

Mr. WALKER. The time is controlled by Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. In my remarks, I talked about how there was a lack of education, a lack of hope, the plantation being very similar to a project. I talked about the fact that today you have people entrapped.

Can you tell me any differences? If not—we ended slavery. If you cannot tell me any differences, I would presume you would also agree that we should end something that is very comparable to slavery.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I do not agree with your thesis that welfare and slavery go hand in hand. What I would like to address, however, is child support.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Could you tell me why you do not agree with that? Do you agree it was a lack of education?

Another question for you, both slavery and welfare will reward or praise the mother for having another child. For the slave, obviously more children would increase the slave master's work force. Our welfare system gives mothers more money for having more babies. Do you agree with this approach, and if so, my wife and I are expecting a baby this month. Should I start to send letters to my constituents asking them for a raise?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. FRANKS, I hope you can raise that child on an average of \$63 a month. That is not enough of an incentive to have another child.

Let me tell you, welfare recipients have smaller families than the average family in this Nation, a family not on welfare.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. She is not answering my question.

Do you agree that we should pay mothers more money for having more babies? That is the question.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I agree that we should not punish the children of those mothers, and that \$63 a month is not enough—

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Does that mean yes or no?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Is not enough to be an incentive to add a person to your family.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. We should pay them more? So I should receive a raise when my baby is born?

Ms. WOOLSEY. If you can afford to raise a child on \$63 a month, that is fine.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. There are a number of individuals today who are earning \$25,000, \$30,000, and \$40,000 a year, and upon their having another baby they cannot walk in to their supervisors and demand an increase in pay.

Ms. WOOLSEY. They get a nice tax deduction for that child.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. They cannot go in and ask for an increase in pay.

My last question, and I will try to be brief with this, lastly, do you believe that noncitizens should receive welfare, with the exception of refugees and individuals over the age of 75?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Noncitizens are not covered by welfare. They have not been, and there are no proposals—

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Currently they are.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Noncitizens, or illegal aliens are not, noncitizens are. Yes, I believe that is part of our society. If we want to debate a change in the Constitution, let us do that later.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. You would want to see taxpayers' dollars go to noncitizens?

Mr. WALKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Now I recognize Ms. WOOLSEY for 4 minutes to question Mr. FRANKS.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. FRANKS, I can tell you as a former welfare mother

that the main reason families are on welfare in the first place is because there aren't enough jobs that pay a family wage, and there aren't the support systems like child care and health care so that they can get off welfare and go into the work force.

I am sure you are aware that we have just been through a recession. Families were struggling to get by, and they are still struggling, just like I did when I was on welfare. In fact, as I said, 18 percent of working families with four members are earning below the poverty level today. Families like this need welfare to survive.

Aren't you aware that the welfare rolls grew primarily because of economic hard times?

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Statistics would show that the growth in poverty that we have seen has been due largely to the growth of the teenagers giving birth out of wedlock, and we have statistics to support that.

Yes, we should try to create more jobs. That is why I have always been a strong advocate of trying to put forth tax policies that would help employers to employ employees. The capital gains tax cut would do that, and a number of other measures.

Yes, we must try to increase the number of jobs. In the last 30 years we have produced 52 million jobs in this country, an average of 1.7 million jobs a year. We have seen programs in your State of California, and in Riverside, CA, a welfare-to-work type of program that was able to increase the number of jobs for individuals on welfare.

Yes, we must try to create jobs. We have to remember that today, unfortunately, we have a number of single parents out there who are teenagers. In the Republican bill we will not allow a teenager to be able to receive, or a minor, to be able to receive welfare benefits. That is, that individual—

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. FRANKS, you have gone past your time, I believe.

How do you explain the Congressional Budget Office report which clearly shows the recession was a major factor in this increased welfare case load since 1989?

I don't need a report to tell me that, because I know from personal experience. I look around my district and I see some of the same things. How do you explain that report, and not put that down to the economy as why welfare is growing?

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. I have not seen that report, but as I stated to you before, we have seen a growth, a rapid growth, of teenaged birth in our society. In the 1980's we had a tremendous amount of economic prosperity during the 1980's, as you well know. We did have a recession. The recession hurt all individuals. It did not hurt just the poor. It hurt those individuals who are in the middle class, it hurt those individuals in the upper class.

Whenever you have a recession, it has a way of hurting all individuals. We are not going to deny that, Ms. WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I think I have to clear something up. One percent of the Nation got a lot richer while the rest of the country got a lot poorer over the last 12 years.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. May I respond to that? More blacks were able, just looking at the black population alone, more blacks were able to move into the middle class during the 1980's than any other time in our history. More blacks were able to buy a home during the 1980's than at any other time in our history, and more blacks were able to purchase a car during that time than any other time in our history. We had the greatest expansion of jobs during the 1980's than any other time in our history during peacetime, so you are wrong.

Ms. WOOLSEY. People got poorer. There is no question about that.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. We had lower class that expanded because we allowed babies to have babies.

Ms. WOOLSEY. What I would like to talk to you about right now is why I had to go on welfare in the first place, because I did not have child support, I did not have health care, and right now out of the \$47 billion that is owed in court-ordered child support every year, only \$13 billion is collected.

How do you propose that we collect that \$34 billion that is the gap between what the States collect and what they are not collecting?

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Ms. WOOLSEY, I say, God bless you. You are an example of a success story, and I am pleased to be able to see that, and to be able to hear you talk about it.

Mr. WALKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. The problem I have with all these individuals is the fathers we have not identified, who are not taking care of their children.

Mr. WALKER. The moderator will now recognize Mr. SHAW of Florida to speak for the opening statement for 1½ minutes.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the moderator. I think we can all agree on what is a fact: If you subsidize something, you will get more of it. The United States Government subsidizes illegitimacy. Amazingly enough, our Government has struck a deal with young women having illegitimate babies: We will give you cash, food, medical care. It is all guaranteed. More than likely, we will also give you housing. That is a package, my friends, that is worth \$16,000 a year. It is guaranteed.

For this, though, you must agree to two conditions: Do not work, and do not get married, and in return we will guarantee that you will live in a permanent state of dependency.

Today 3 of 10 births in America are to unmarried women. The rate of black

babies is a shocking 7 out of 10 babies. President Clinton has admitted that welfare plays a strong role in promoting illegitimate birth and single-parent families. Social scientists agree that children raised in single-parent families get less education, they are more likely to be on welfare as adults, and are more likely to commit illegal acts. It is clear that the presence of a male and a female role model in the house is essential to a well-rounded upbringing.

□ 1930

Yes; there are heroic women who do a wonderful job raising their children. We have just heard from one. But virtually no one disputes the fact that on the average kids from single-parent families have more problems than kids from two-parent families.

Mr. WALKER. The time has expired. The Democratic team is now recognized to interrogate Mr. SHAW for 4 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. SHAW, how much does aid to dependent children pay a family of three in your district?

Mr. SHAW. In Florida? Well, this is one of the problems that I have been noticing on your questioning.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I know the answer.

Mr. SHAW. What you are asking, you are adding up, just taking aid to families with dependent children.

Ms. WOOLSEY. That is what I asked.

Mr. SHAW. When you talk about welfare, you have to talk about food stamps, you have to talk about child nutrition programs, you have to talk about housing, you have to talk about all of the things that come into this.

Ms. WOOLSEY. That is not what we are talking about.

Mr. SHAW. Even without housing, it amounts to \$12,000 a year in the State of Florida, and I think it is even higher in your State of California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, as a matter of fact, aid for dependent children, which is welfare, and that is what we are talking about tonight, welfare reform, we are not talking about food stamp reform.

Mr. SHAW. I disagree emphatically. We are not just talking about—

Mr. WALKER. The time is controlled by the Democratic team.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Aid for dependent children in your State pays an average of \$367 a month. Let me ask you: Do you think that is living high on the hog?

Mr. SHAW. When you add to it the other benefits, it is certainly above minimum wage. Minimum wage in this country is only about \$8,800 a year. Now we are competing and having the people on welfare getting a total package without housing of \$12,000 a year. Where is the incentive to go to work when you can go to work and get a reduction? That is the problem with the system. That is why welfare is not working in this country today, as you,

much to our surprise, in your opening statement said, that the welfare system is sick and must be corrected.

Our position is that it is a disincentive to work, it is a disincentive to independent self-empowerment, to maintaining control over their lives today.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. SHAW, I cannot understand, given the zeal with which you want to clear the welfare rolls, why your side of the aisle seems to be against all training for people on welfare.

Mr. SHAW. That is absolutely—

Ms. NORTON. I have the time. Sixty-eight percent of the American people are saying that they are willing to pay more to clear the rolls. I want to ask you about a person like a hypothetical Mary who worked all of her life, lived in a steel town, got laid off, used up her unemployment insurance, had to go on welfare, now has no job. There are no jobs of the kind she was trained for. Want to be trained for a permanent job. Why, Mr. SHAW, should not Mary be trained for a permanent job so that she can leave welfare? She has a work history all her life.

Mr. SHAW. Oh, Ms. NORTON, I am sure you will be quite surprised to know I agree with you. She should be trained. And this is exactly what the Republican bill has said.

The Republican bill says that this woman who is on welfare deserves a second chance. We will give her education, we will give her training, we will even search for a job for her, and we are going to limit that to 2 years.

Ms. NORTON. Your bill calls for job search. What Mary needs is training because in the steel town—

Mr. SHAW. It has training.

Ms. NORTON. She cannot qualify for the other jobs.

Mr. SHAW. Ms. NORTON, I know you hear me, but you are not listening. Training is in the Republican bill.

Ms. NORTON. So you concede that training—

Mr. SHAW. Perhaps you would like to join us in the discharge petition we have filed today.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Shaw, you concede that training has to be a part of any successful strategy to remove people off the welfare rolls?

Mr. SHAW. You are so right.

Ms. NORTON. Even if it costs money to do so?

Mr. SHAW. You are so right. And do you know how we get that money, because it does cost money? We say that this is only available to citizens of the United States, and people who are here as political refugees or people over 70 years old. And we create a \$20 billion surplus.

What we are doing is taking care of our own people. We are training them, we are giving them self-esteem, and we are going to get them back into the job market. We are going to give them independence.

Ms. NORTON. Of course, if Mary does not have a job after she has been trained, you will kick her off welfare at that point.

Mr. WALKER. The time has expired.

Mr. SHAW. If I may respond to the last question, Mr. Moderator?

Mr. WALKER. Briefly.

Mr. SHAW. If she cannot find a job, we will get one for her. We need more child care, we need cleaning up at the housing projects, we need these things. All we require is that after that 2 years she is going to work for these benefits.

Mr. WALKER. We now will have Ms. NORTON speaking against the opening statement for 1½ minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the present welfare system is a monument to passive government. It helps you get on. It will not do anything to help you work your way off.

There is only one solution that will work, and that solution is work, steady work and steady income sufficient to support a family.

Work is the solution of choice of the American people as well, and is the solution of choice of welfare recipients. Work is not just what welfare recipients want. Work is what welfare recipients do. More than two-thirds of them leave the rolls by themselves.

The Congress has to focus on what the problem, the real problem is here. It is not getting off, it is keeping off. They come back for lack of a steady job that pays enough to support their family or the sine qua non for keeping a job, and that is a place to leave your child.

You are not serious about welfare reform unless you are serious about jobs that pay a family wage and assist people in finding a place to leave their children. The obligation to support one's own child is undebatable. There is no easy or cheap way out however for the Congress because two-thirds of the people we are talking about are children.

There should be no free lunch for mothers on welfare. But we will find out that neither is there a free lunch for Congress as it strives to reduce the welfare rolls.

Mr. WALKER. The Republican team will now be recognized for 4 minutes to interrogate Ms. NORTON.

Mr. DELAY. I must say, Ms. NORTON, it looks like we have agreement that welfare has done harm, more harm than good, listening to the opponents to the proposition. Maybe we ought to get down into the details.

I do not know where you all get your figures, but they are really fun to listen to, but inaccurate. I have got several charts here that I would like to explain to you. These charts are given to us by the Congressional Budget Office and the Congressional Research Service run by the Democrat majority that controls this House. It shows that welfare spending from 1950 to 1992 has in-

creased significantly, gone out of sight; yet at the same time, AFDC enrollment has gone out of sight, the illegitimacy rate has gone out of sight, the poverty rate has gone out of sight.

Mr. WALKER. Question, please.

Mr. DELAY. How do you explain that you want to continue more of the same but expand more spending on welfare, and it will not change these numbers?

Ms. NORTON. I remind you it is a Democratic President who has come forward with the notion that we should fundamentally change welfare as we know it. We are not foolish, however. As I said in my statement a moment ago, there is no free lunch or cheap way to cut the welfare rolls.

In order to cut the welfare rolls we are going to have to do what business does when it wants a return on its investment. We are going to have to invest in those people if we want them to stay off of welfare.

Mr. DELAY. An investment means more spending. So what you want—

Ms. NORTON. Investment.

Mr. DELAY. But what the President says is a notion, not a bill. He has yet to come with a bill. But what I have heard three speakers now talk about is more spending. So you want to end welfare as we know it, but you want to create more welfare as we know it, and you want to preserve welfare as we know it, and you want to go in all directions at once, right?

Ms. NORTON. Sixty-eight percent of the American people said they would be willing to spend more if you could get people off welfare and keep them off welfare.

What we want to do is to take this matter in gulps that are digestible by our economy and move people off of welfare and keep them off of welfare. Recidivism we see on welfare comes precisely from the fact that the welfare system as now structured gives them no help, gives them no training.

If in fact a mother has a place to leave her child that is reliable, if in fact a mother has a job that is reliable and pays enough, she will not come back on welfare.

What you want to do is throw her off when in fact she cannot find another job. You want to say too bad, you and your children too, we have no more responsibility for you.

Ms. MOLINARI. Ms. NORTON, if in fact we came up with a proposal that says we will provide education and training and day care and help you find a job, would you agree to a bill that eliminates AFDC payments after 2 years to the recipients?

Ms. NORTON. I would agree to the elimination of AFDC payments if in fact a person has lived by the rules and has found a job. If in fact that person has done all you say but lives in the steel town that Mary lives in that I just described, and she cannot find a job, if she lives in Washington, DC. And

the inner city where 12 percent of the people are unemployed, then of course I am not going to throw her and her children out in the street.

□ 1940

Mr. WALKER. Republicans control the time.

Ms. MOLINARI. Under the Republican proposal, we would then provide her with a job. Presumably, though, from your response, the answer is no.

Ms. NORTON. If you provide her with a job, of course, you provide her with a job at less than the living wage. Suppose that job, however, suppose even after that she cannot find a job, you then throw her off welfare anyway.

Mr. WALKER. Time is expired.

Ms. MOLINARI. It would be the same benefit as if she had found a job in the private sector.

Mr. WALKER. Time is expired. The moderator will now recognize Ms. MOLINARI to speak for the resolution for 1½ minutes.

Ms. MOLINARI. Thank you.

The probability of a child growing up to be dependent on welfare is four times greater if that child comes from a welfare-dependent family. Welfare is not working.

While one-half of mothers on welfare are off in 1 year, 75 percent will end up back on the welfare rolls for at least part of the next 8 years.

Welfare is not working. America has gambled with \$5 trillion, more than our national debt, but has never stopped to see that welfare just is not working.

Since the War on Poverty began in 1965, we have increased spending more than 14 times, with basic spending on poor individuals going up fivefold, yet during this very same period we have made no progress against poverty. People more than ever use welfare.

The illegitimacy rate has quadrupled, and our violent-crime rate has quintupled.

If we are going to continue to help people, and we should, we must demand change for the recipients' sake and the very survival of our society.

We must have the courage to break that cycle of poverty, because only then can we make sure that welfare will work.

Mr. WALKER. Thank you. And now the Democratic team will have 4 minutes to interrogate Ms. MOLINARI.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Congresswoman, I was on welfare for 3 years. I do not know what my children would have done without that safety net.

Since Republicans propose completely denying all benefits to these families after a short period of time, what do you propose to do with the children? Are you supporting your Republican colleagues who want to put these children in Government-run orphanages or putting them up for adoption?

Ms. MOLINARI. Under the Republican proposal, the short period of time

to which you just referred is a full 2 years, and during those 2 years we are going to provide women with education, with day care, with, in fact, job training. And we will provide, if they still cannot find a job, with the Government's assistance, a Government-sponsored job to help create and fill in the voids that exist for our society.

And the other thing that we are going to be doing to help the children that you talk about is to enable that mother to feel good about herself, something I know you more than any of us can truly identify with, thereby forcing that woman to, yes, provide a truly integrous role model for the children to which you have just referred.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Let me remind you, I was educated, I was healthy, my children were healthy, and you know I was aggressive and assertive. I was on welfare for 3 years.

Ms. MOLINARI. I have no doubt about that, Ms. WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I was on welfare for 3 years.

Your district in New York City has an unemployment rate of 11.7 percent; almost 30 percent of the households are headed by women. How many people on welfare in your district could get off in 2 years?

Ms. MOLINARI. Ms. WOOLSEY, unfortunately, my district that you just described is very accurate. But unfortunately we have tremendous societal needs that could truly be addressed under the Republican alternative if we created those Government-sponsored jobs that allowed women to, in fact, while their children were receiving day care, come into the communities and run day-care sessions of their own, help to engage in a graffiti program so we could clean up and feel good about our inner-city communities. Oh, Ms. WOOLSEY, I would need more than 4 minutes to respond to that question to tell you all the needs we could find that that working mother, if she wanted to work, could truly add to society and herself and the well-being of her family.

Mr. MCCURDY. Ms. MOLINARI, sometimes it seems like we are talking past each other here, and I am not so sure that in many cases we are not closer to having agreement than we are actually arguing.

Ms. MOLINARI. And I am grateful. I think this debate has at least illuminated that, yes.

Mr. MCCURDY. We have heard a lot about teen pregnancy, and the Republicans have argued that welfare has caused illegitimacy and an outbreak of out-of-wedlock births in this country.

But, in fact, we have an alarming rate in nonwelfare society as well. And within the bill, there is nothing there to really address teenage pregnancy other than cutting off benefits. Would you not rather join a Democratic proposal to have a national campaign to fight teen pregnancies, to prevent teen

pregnancies, so that we can actually address the real problem in America?

Ms. MOLINARI. Clearly, you know, Mr. MCCURDY, I do support prevention, and I do think that maybe someday if we all do our job that a discussion such as we have will not be necessary, because we will have finally gotten to help educate young women as to what is going to happen.

But first we have got to create, and now you said that we say that welfare causes pregnancies. I do not think that is true. But it certainly encourages pregnancies.

Whether or not we want to say that woman is on welfare at the time that she gets pregnant, it is, in fact, a fact that 80 percent of teen mothers will be on welfare within 5 years, so they do take advantage of the system. They know it is the system that is there, and it is, in fact, the system that perhaps has led them astray, has told them they do not need to seek out their male counterparts for responsibility, and this fact has placed them in a cycle to which most of them will find a very difficult time of breaking out.

Mr. WALKER. Time has expired.

The moderator will now recognize Mr. MCCURDY to speak against the resolution for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MCCURDY. Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Tonight I want to talk about what I consider the most critical aspect of welfare reform and that is individual responsibility. Welfare reform must reconnect recipients to the world of work and reestablish the traditional American values of work, family, individual responsibility, and opportunity.

In exchange for transitional support in search of a job, en route to a job, recipients must assume personal responsibility on their part and their end of the contract, finding a job, getting job training, and in other ways working themselves off the welfare rolls.

As part of that contract, we must change the culture of welfare, and to those who administer it today, as just a way to qualify for income maintenance, to job placement; a reform system must reward work and encourage two-parent families. It should also provide incentives to young people to make better choices with regard to parenting and getting an education.

It also needs to have stiff enforcement for fathers who neglect child support payments.

Welfare must be a hand up, not a handout, and, therefore, it must be an invitation to join the American work force, to break out of the cycle of poverty and despair and offer hope for the future.

It can work. I have personally seen successful projects in California, Wisconsin, Indiana, and my own State of Oklahoma. I only hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, will support smart and responsible welfare reform.

Mr. WALKER. The time is expired.

The moderator will now recognize the Republican team to interrogate Mr. MCCURDY for 4 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. MCCURDY, do you support what the President's task force on welfare reform has presented to the President?

Mr. MCCURDY. I think we are here tonight in large part because the President has said we must meet, we have to change welfare as we know it, in this country, and I believe the task force has done yeoman work in presenting an outline and a model.

As a matter of fact, many of the Republican proposals that I am aware of have come directly from the suggestions of the task force.

Mr. DELAY. They are going to change welfare as we know it, that is for sure. They are going to make it bigger.

The Task Force on Welfare Reform has suggested that we make work pay by guaranteeing health care, by advance payments of EITC, a brand-new entitlement program, expanding child care, spending an additional \$8 billion to \$12 billion more, and they do not know how to pay for it.

Should we not make work necessary rather than pay, than create new entitlement programs, and expanding the existing entitlements?

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. DELAY, quite frankly, some of the concern I have is the Republican proposal actually spends more money than what the White House Task Force is proposing.

Mr. DELAY. Have you read our proposal?

Mr. MCCURDY. I have, indeed. I have spoken with the sponsors of it.

Mr. DELAY. It saves \$20 billion over 5 years.

Mr. MCCURDY. It is actually now talking about spending more money than what the Democratic task force has suggested.

Mr. DELAY. No; not at all. You have not read our proposal.

Mr. MCCURDY. I actually have a proposal that works to address many of those obstacles to work.

What we are arguing and what the President has said is work must pay, and that is why we supported an earned income tax credit which takes the minimum wage job, by tax credit, and supplement to and through the employer, to make it a paying job.

There are real obstacles to paying.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. MCCURDY, you mentioned just about a short minute ago, maybe a long minute ago, that we took from the President's bill.

I would like to ask you: Have you had an opportunity to read the Shaw-Weber bill that was filed about 4 years ago? I would, if you have not, enlighten you to tell you that there is nothing that the President has said right here in these Chambers, in the State of the Union, or publicly said with regard to welfare, that was not in that bill.

Mr. McCURDY. Are you not pleased that finally we have some bipartisan support in this country to solve real problems? And the debate tonight has really been a recommendation on how do we solve problems.

□ 1950

Mr. SHAW. Could I ask you a question, then, as one of the leading Republican—excuse me—one of the leading Democrat advocates of what I consider real welfare reform, as you certainly are, I am sure you would be one of the first to see the President's bill. Have you yet to see the President's bill, or do you know if it is even written? Because we have not received it on this side.

Mr. McCURDY. We have met a number of times with the White House task force on welfare reform.

Mr. SHAW. Has the bill been written yet?

Mr. McCURDY. I do not believe it has.

Mr. SHAW. The President promised to have a bill by this time.

Mr. McCURDY. If I may respond, the President has made a commitment to present a welfare reform bill this year. I am presenting a bill next week with a large group of Democrats. But we also represent some diversity on this side of the aisle.

Mr. SHAW. We concede that.

Mr. McCURDY. We believe that maybe we are fighting—

Mr. SHAW. The answer to the question is "no," you have not seen the President's bill. Is that correct?

Mr. McCURDY. No, and quite frankly I have not read your bill as well, the Shaw-Weber bill, but I have read the one by Mr. SANTORUM.

Mr. SHAW. The one by Mr. SANTORUM and those of us on the task force on this side have written comes from—much of it is taken from the Weber bill. It is a kinder, gentler Shaw-Weber bill, I might say.

Mr. McCURDY. In many respects, there are some elements within the bill that the President of the United States has also embraced; a 2-year time limit, trying to reduce obstacles to work, having job training.

Mr. WALKER. The time has expired. The moderator will now recognize the Democratic team to interrogate Mr. DELAY for 4 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. DELAY, you have completely fudged, you and your team, the final outcome.

Mr. DELAY. Wait a minute, do I have fudge all over me?

Ms. NORTON. Please do not take away from my time. Let me put before you the scenario that would be created by the Republican approach. Here is Sally Jones, she wants to play by your rules. She lives at home, that is, when she was a teen parent, just as you would want her to do instead of going on welfare. She could not find—she

went back to high school, has not been able to find a job. She has worked off her grant, and she has gone past your 3 years, but she lives in a high unemployment area and she has not been able to find a job, does not have any car.

Mr. WALKER. Question, please.

Ms. NORTON. The question is: After she has played by all of your rules and she still cannot find a job, would you kick her off of welfare, which is to say her child?

Mr. DELAY. No, no. We are going to say to her, if you continue to receive benefits, you have got to work at least 35 hours a week.

Ms. NORTON. You will let her work 35 hours a week?

Mr. DELAY. Not "let her."

Ms. NORTON. As long as necessary to support her child, she will never be kicked off welfare?

Mr. DELAY. No. She will receive benefits, but she has to work for those benefits. What is wrong with working and earning the benefits you are receiving?

Ms. NORTON. Nothing is wrong with earning the benefits you are receiving. That is indeed what we would want. Of course, she would be working at less than the minimum wage for 35 hours a week under the Republican approach. I doubt that that is—

Mr. DELAY. What you would have, Ms. NORTON, have her do is to be isolated in a room somewhere with her kids and not let her out.

Ms. NORTON. I would want—

Mr. DELAY. What we would want her to do—

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Moderator, is the time not mine?

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

Mr. DELAY. Well, may I answer the question?

Ms. NORTON. The question is—

Mr. DELAY. Do you have a question?

Ms. NORTON. The President's approach is a public service job, a public service job, not a 35-hour-per-week job where you work for \$2 an hour and ultimately lose your welfare benefits anyway.

Mr. DELAY. Do I have a question here, or do I get to listen to a lecture?

Mr. McCURDY. I have a question, too, if you like.

Mr. DELAY. Could I answer the lecture? First off, let me say we have not seen what the President has, we have just seen the leaks that he put out and the balloons that he sent up out of the White House to see what would go with the polls. But what we have seen is more welfare, more programs, more entitlements.

What we want is we want to give that young mother an opportunity to get out, out of that isolation that you want to put her in and keep her in, because the best way to get a job is from another job. So, if she is out there working at least, for her benefits as a

teachers aide or daycare aide or just working around her public housing unit, cleaning it up, cleaning graffiti off, she is going to meet other people and know that there is a real world out there and those people will help her get a job. It is called the real world, earning your way.

Mr. McCURDY. May I ask a question? I was in Indianapolis, IN, in a project called America Works, where they emphasize job placement. There has been a great deal of success. A young man in that room told me that he had a job in the private sector that had insurance, but because his son had a preexisting condition, it made more economic sense for him to go back on welfare and get Medicaid. You cite the increased cost in entitlement spending, but half of that cost today is in Medicaid.

Would you not rather join and have a responsible approach that reduces those obstacles to work and actually have real health care reform and try to—which is a primary ingredient in any kind of welfare reform?

Mr. WALKER. Question?

Mr. DELAY. Well, I did not know we were debating health care reform. Our bill eliminates preexisting conditions. For example, in your example, he would be able to get health care, and if he could not, he could go onto the Medicaid system. So we are not any way different in that regard.

Mr. WALKER. Time has expired.

Now the Republican team will interrogate Mr. SYNAR for 4 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. SYNAR, let us stay with the real-world example here. It is my belief that some welfare dollars are ending up in the hands of drug dealers. We all have heard about the Chicago welfare story where 20 people were living in a 2-bedroom apartment, 4 adults were receiving \$4,500 per month in cash payments. It was alleged that some of these welfare dollars were going to support their drug habit. What would you recommend to stop cash from being used in this manner?

Mr. SYNAR. Well, I am glad you brought that up, because I think it is a problem that all of us Republicans and Democrats should be sensitive to. Let us first of all complement your President, our President, George Bush, who during his administration really squeezed out a lot of the fraud and abuse that was in the welfare system. In fact, the overpayment rate, for example, has gone to just about 4.96 percent, which is down 17 percent from just 1991.

All of us believe in better enforcement. You would argue for a debit, where people would do that. What we are working for as Democrats is to give them a credit, a credit card, and a future.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Getting back to the point that you brought

up—I did not bring up—that is the debit card which would allow for us as taxpayers to have an accounting of all dollars spent by welfare recipients—and we do the same for defense contractors today. We get an accounting of every single dollar the defense contractor would spend to construct a helicopter or an airplane. One again, it is not hurting, it is not hurting the recipients of welfare, but it is hurting, potentially, drug dealers. Would you be in support of a proposal of that nature?

Mr. SYNAR. As I said, I think that the Democratic Party would be more interested in a credit card approach rather than a debit card.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. The bottom line is: Would you be interested in eliminating cash? Like some example, obviously we want to have direct payments to landlords, utility companies, some incidental cash being given to the individual. But the principle of not allowing what we saw in Chicago to happen anywhere else in America, would you be in favor of that type of structure, where we would have an accounting of the dollars that are being spent on welfare?

Mr. SYNAR. Recognizing that the gentleman and I agree that we have better enforcement, I think the gentleman would also agree that if you have simply a debit, you move yourself right back into the category of your opening statement, which is slavery, which are no options at all. With cash, used responsibly, you give options and get away from that slavery.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. This is simply an accounting type of measure. It eliminates fraud.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. SYNAR, I was taken by your opening statement in which I think you might have even caught us a little off balance by moving closer to our side of the debate than we anticipated from your opening remarks. But I compliment you for your candor because what we are trying to do is to craft a welfare bill that will empower the poor and get them out of the cycle of poverty. Would you support a bill that requires work after 2 years, 2 years and you have got to accept a job that is given to you or your benefits are cut off?

Mr. SYNAR. I think that is an excellent question, Mr. SHAW. I think both parties agree the best way to eliminate the welfare cycle is to provide good jobs to help you raise your family.

Mr. SHAW. Would you support one that would require that?

Mr. SYNAR. We can require jobs that may not be available. That is the problem.

Mr. SHAW. If it is not, you supply them. But you take the basic proposition that you will support the enforcement that in 2 years you have got to work at something, if you cannot find a job we will find one for you, and if we can find one for you, then you

know at that point you have got to take it or we will find it for you. The question I have as a follow-up because I am seeing a little hesitation on your side, what does this have to pay? And if we supply such a job, a public service job, the one Mr. FRANKS talked about and the one Ms. MOLINARI talked about, like taking graffiti off the wall in the housing project, helping there, helping with daycare?

Mr. WALKER. Question, please?

Mr. SHAW. The question is: Would you include as part of that payment for that job the other benefits that are received, or would you say that you have got to pay at least minimum wage?

□ 2000

Mr. WALKER. The time is expired. I will give the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR] a brief period to respond.

Mr. SYNAR. I think the basic difference between the Republican approach and the Democratic approach that we are talking about tonight is that you would cut people off. We want to build for the future through work, 2 years is inflexible. We believe that there would be cases like Ms. WOOLSEY's, that 3 years is more appropriate and, in a lot of cases, where 2 years is too much. We believe in the flexibility to adjust to the individual circumstances.

Mr. WALKER. The time is expired.

The moderator will now recognize the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW] to question the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for 4 minutes.

Mr. SHAW. Ms. NORTON, I would like to explore what I see is a possible division in the ranks on your side to see if I can put a spotlight on it to try to set up the stage as to where we are going to be when this debate finally comes to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Do you agree, and I would ask you to answer this yes or no, do you agree that there is a welfare crisis in this country today?

Ms. NORTON. Of course. The Democrats have taken the initiative to deal with that crisis.

Mr. SHAW. If you would send us your bill, I would be happy to see it because I have not seen the Democratic bill, and—

Ms. NORTON. Sorry?

Mr. SHAW. Seen the Democratic bill, and I don't think—

Ms. NORTON. Well, let me—

Mr. SHAW. And what have you, the Democrats, done to take the lead in the House on welfare reform? I very much want to know that because I am on the committee that has jurisdiction.

Ms. NORTON. Even before the President submitted his health care reform bill, it was clear he had taken the lead on that issue. He has made the crisis of the welfare system an issue for the

first time in this country, and, when it comes to overall change—

Mr. SHAW. But the President—

Ms. NORTON. But the President's bill has not been submitted yet and is a testament to his desire to make sure we do not have to raise our taxes in order to reform the welfare system and that we indeed have an effective system when he presents his bill.

So, not to worry. Only a little longer.

Mr. SHAW. Well, he says that there is a health crisis in this country, and we cannot even get a health care bill out of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. NORTON. But he submitted one; did he not?

Mr. SHAW. And I might also point out to you and ask you to perhaps give us some inside information. We have been asking the chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee, on which I serve on the Committee on Ways and Means, to have hearings and do things, and we cannot even get a bill to start with. I ask, do you have a bill that you think that he might be able to use, that we can—

Ms. NORTON. The outline of the President's bill has not come from leaks, but from briefings of the press, and if your concern is you do not have a bill yet, then I can only say that you will have a bill soon, and the bill you have will be better because the President has insisted upon perfecting it before sending it here.

Mr. SHAW. Ms. NORTON, one-seventh of this economy he turned over to Mrs. Clinton to write a health care bill. She did that in less than a year. You have admitted, or you have stated very forcefully, that there is a welfare crisis in this country. I ask, don't you think he could have produced one?

Ms. NORTON. I think he could have produced one if he wanted to spend a great deal more money and raise the taxes of American citizens. What has taken the time—

Mr. SHAW. Reclaiming the time—

Ms. NORTON. Could I answer the question?

Mr. SHAW. Reclaiming my time—I am reclaiming my time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. SHAW is in control of the time.

Mr. SHAW. I think the question is: "Do you see any way that we can create a health care bill maybe by looking at who receives—excuse me, welfare bill—by seeing who receives the benefits, and then all join together and decide that we need to take care of Americans first, and that the job training, the job search, and what we are doing for genuine reform should really be made available to the American citizens and to people who are here as political refugees and not offer to the citizens of the world who come into our country—do you support such a proposition?"

Ms. NORTON. The citizens of the world, of course, cannot get welfare.

The people who can get welfare are indeed citizens of the United States.

Mr. SHAW. Let me share this with the gentlewoman then: We sent our welfare bill, which has the training that you want, has the job search that you want, supplies a job at the end of the time, which you want even though we may disagree on how much that person is to be paid, and simply, by making it not available to the people you said it was not available to anybody, but which it is available to—

Mr. WALKER. Question, please.

Mr. SHAW. We create \$20 million surplus. Could you support such a proposition?

Ms. NORTON. The gentleman would deny benefits even to legal aliens and, as a result, create problems for us that we do not have now because, as the Supreme Court said in the case involving some public schools, students—

Mr. WALKER. Time expired.

Ms. NORTON. We lose more than we gain if we deny legal aliens the right to go to school.

Mr. WALKER. Ms. NORTON is now recognized for 4 minutes to question Mr. SHAW.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. SHAW, I am interested in the position your party took when President Clinton sought to expand the tax credit for working families. As we know, there are many more working poor people than there are welfare poor. Only a third of single mothers even get welfare. These are the most vulnerable people for going on welfare however.

Why is it, therefore, that the Republicans did not support the expansion of the family tax credit when that would be an important way to prevent people from having to go on welfare in the first place?

Mr. SHAW. The earned income tax credit, which the gentlewoman well knows was a product of two Republican administrations, was expanded three times during the Republicans' administrations—

Ms. NORTON. So why do you support the expansion this time, Mr. SHAW? Most of you did not.

Mr. SHAW. Because it was not paid for. It was a budget buster, and this is something that I feel is very irresponsible. We are not helping—we are not helping even the kids on welfare—

Ms. NORTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. SHAW, the President—

Mr. WALKER. The gentlewoman controls the time.

Ms. NORTON. Had a deficit reduction package there. Not only was this paid for, but in fact we will end up—we would end up paying much more if we had not expanded that tax credit. If anything is going to save us money—

Mr. SHAW. You are talking—

Ms. NORTON. It is encouraging the working poor to work instead of going on welfare.

Why did not the Republicans who, the gentleman is right, supported this

year after year, simply embraced this welfare prevention bill?

Mr. SHAW. Ms. NORTON, am I correct in saying that what you are talking about is the biggest tax increase in the history of this country?

Ms. NORTON. No, the gentleman is not correct in saying that is what I am talking about.

What I am talking about is the gentleman's non-support of help for working families which makes them more vulnerable to going on welfare. That is what I am talking about—

Mr. SHAW. Ms. NORTON, you are talking about—is the Clinton tax bill—

Ms. NORTON. Changing the subject; let me move on.

Mr. SHAW. It also was—

Ms. NORTON. I say, "You have changed the subject, Mr. SHAW."

The fact is the gentleman did not support it; right? Yes or no?

You did not support—

Mr. SHAW. You bet your life—

Ms. NORTON. Attempt to expand, help the working families that would have kept people on welfare—

Mr. SHAW. I did not—

Ms. NORTON. All right. He cannot answer my question, so, reclaiming my time—

Mr. SHAW. Right, I did not support—

Ms. NORTON. Now, the income for families maintained by women over the past 10 years has gone down in real dollars. I ask, "How do you propose that these women will have sufficient income to maintain their families without a safety net?"

Mr. SHAW. Well, I think there has to be a safety net, and there must be—and I think that is what we are supporting on our side.

One of the problems, and the problem that we really have not—not approached here as a Congress is the question of male responsibility. There are more teenaged kids having babies, more single mothers having babies, and the father gets a free ride. I have heard of instances—two and three in the hospital at the same time.

Ms. NORTON. Bipartisanship on something, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SHAW. Well, let us mark that down because we are going to work together to see that there is male responsibility. It is time that the men of this country learned that they have a responsibility for raising these kids, and we, as a Federal Government, are going to do everything we can to assist the States in forcing the child support payments that are due the mothers, and, by the way, in the Republican bill we require the mothers to identify the fathers so we can go after them.

Ms. NORTON. As would we.

Let the record show, Mr. Chairman, that there is agreement on a very important item in the welfare debate, and that is male responsibility.

Mr. SHAW. I look forward to working with the gentlewoman on it.

Mr. WALKER. The moderator will now recognize the Democratic team to interrogate the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS] for 4 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. FRANKS, a favorite scholar of the Republican persuasion, Mr. Charles Murray, has drawn a distinction of late between how he would treat divorced mothers and never-married mothers. He would, he said, deny benefits to the children of never-married mothers altogether while allowing some welfare benefits for divorced mothers.

I ask, "Do you endorse this notion of the—"

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. No.

Ms. NORTON. The sins, you will forgive me, visited upon innocent children?

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. No.

Ms. NORTON. Would you indicate what your position would be then; no distinction based on prior marital—

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. No, there should be no difference.

□ 2010

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. There should be no difference. It is very simple. Next question, please.

Ms. NORTON. Glad to see this reputation.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. I will bring it over to you if you want to see it. It is right in here. Same thing.

Ms. NORTON. It is important we have it on the record.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. We will send you a copy. Same thing. Next question, please.

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. FRANKS, we had agreement with Mr. SHAW earlier on the responsibility of males in society to provide child support. As the father of teenagers, both male and female, I strongly support that notion, but within the Republican bill, obviously there is a requirement of no additional payments to the mother, a requirement that she may have to live at home, but there is no provision for providing training to the young father. In fact, the record should reflect that it is generally poor women giving birth because of poor men, and we want to be able to address that kind of problem as well in order that they be responsible.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Our teenage fathers are eligible, just like anybody else.

I agree with you. I know a male today who has had two women pregnant at the same time in the hospital and has not been accountable for taking care of either one of them. You are absolutely right. We have to take the parental identification very seriously and in our bill we do. If that mother does not identify the father, she would not be eligible for benefits. That is a very important component. We also penalize States for not improving on our

parental identification aspect. In our bill, we have \$12 billion over 5 years dedicated toward training and mandatory work, \$12 billion, that is on top of the \$5.5 billion that we are spending today on jobs and training.

In our bill, we will say to that father—

Mr. WALKER. The Democrats control the time.

Mr. MCCURDY. If the primary source of welfare is AFDC, males are not qualified for that, and if they cannot get into a program, are you expanding your program to include males and females?

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. We say in our bill to that young male, first we have to identify him, obviously.

Mr. MCCURDY. I agree.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Then we give that person three options: Find a job and support your children, go to jail, or you have a State-supported type job as we talked about before, community service type job. We also within our bill talk about training and we talk about obviously trying to—Ms. NORTON wants to ask another question.

Ms. NORTON. I want to ask you one other question, a very important concession you made on Charles Murray.

Do you also reject his notion that we should end welfare immediately and, rather, embrace the bill that the Republicans now have?

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. No, I do not know why we are here defending Charles Murray. We are giving him a lot of attention. Hopefully, he has a book he is trying to push. You are doing wonders to make his book become a best seller. I am not here to support Charles Murray. We have a bill as Republicans. I have offered other bills as a Republican. I could care less about defending Mr. Murray.

Ms. NORTON. That brings us closer together, Mr. FRANKS.

Mr. WALKER. The time has expired. We will now have the Republican team interrogate Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. DELAY. Ms. WOOLSEY, I have to commend you for getting off welfare and working your way out of that obviously horrible situation, but I am curious. If our bill had been law at the time you went on welfare, do you realize that after 2 years, you would still receive benefits, in fact more benefits than you probably got back then, and you would receive the education and job training and all that? But after 2 years, you would be required to work either in the private sector or work for your benefits.

Do you have any objection that in the third year that you are on welfare that you would work for your benefits?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Oh, I do not think you heard me. I worked before I was on welfare. I worked the entire time I was on welfare.

Mr. DELAY. That is not my question. My question is, would you have objected—

Ms. WOOLSEY. You are asking me what I would have done.

Mr. DELAY. What I am asking is, would you have objected to working—did you have a private sector job? Obviously you did not.

Your third year of welfare, would you have objected to working?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Obviously I did not what, Mr. DELAY?

Mr. DELAY. I am sorry.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Obviously I did not what, Mr. DELAY? You said obviously I did not. Did not what?

Mr. DELAY. Obviously you did not work.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I did work.

Mr. DELAY. Not your third year.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I worked the entire time I was on welfare. That was 25 years ago. When I was on welfare, I received enough welfare help to pay for child care, to have health care. That is what I needed. If I had had that through child support, I would not have needed it.

Mr. DELAY. But you do not have to work today. My question is, in your third year, and you could not find a private sector job, would you have minded working for your benefits?

Ms. WOOLSEY. See, I believe going to school, being trained—

Mr. DELAY. You have done that for 2 years. You get 2 years to do that. I am talking about the third year.

Ms. WOOLSEY. No, I do not believe we can be that inflexible. It is a laudable goal to get people off welfare.

Mr. DELAY. It is inflexible to ask you to work for your benefits?

Ms. WOOLSEY. It is inflexible to expect every recipient to be ready to go to work after 2 years. Some of them are not literate.

Mr. DELAY. Just 35 hours a week?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Some of them have tiny babies.

Mr. DELAY. We will give you day care.

So you do object?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I do object. Two years and you are off is too limiting. But I think that we should be working so that we get people off, into jobs that pay a family wage and keep them off forever.

Mr. DELAY. Do you agree with Ms. NORTON that we ought to be raising taxes to pay for more welfare and more expanded programs, taxes from people that are not on it?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I believe that we should be collecting the child support that is owed though court orders which is not paid every year, which is \$34 billion. If we even collected half of that, then we would not have a problem today.

Mr. DELAY. But we spend \$240 billion on welfare. How is \$34 billion going to help?

Ms. WOOLSEY. \$34 billion would offset the expansion that it needs right now.

Ms. MOLINARI. You said you require more flexibility than the 2 years and you are off.

Would you agree with a 3-year, or does flexibility go up to 10 years? At what point do we in society say: Flexibility, time is up, it is now up to society to expect you to contribute? Could you just answer that question?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Every person stays on welfare less than 2 years.

Ms. MOLINARI. If you were to write a bill—

Ms. WOOLSEY. I have introduced a bill.

Ms. MOLINARI. You have no time limit.

Ms. WOOLSEY. No time limit?

Ms. MOLINARI. Someone could, based on flexibility, stay on welfare 10 years?

Ms. WOOLSEY. My bill invests in getting people ready to go to work, getting them off the welfare system.

Mr. DELAY. No matter how much it costs?

Ms. MOLINARI. No time limit? Ten, fifteen, twenty years? If they need the flexibility you are talking about, your bill gives them that flexibility.

Ms. WOOLSEY. There are some people on welfare who will be on welfare forever.

Mr. DELAY. How much does your bill cost?

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. It sounds like slavery to me.

Ms. WOOLSEY. There are people that are ill, people that are disabled.

Mr. WALKER. Time has expired.

Mr. DELAY is now recognized for 4 minutes to question Mr. SYNAR.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. SYNAR, this has been a pretty good debate, and I think we are getting to the bottom of it. It seems that your side sort of agrees that welfare does a little more harm than good, but maybe not as much and we just need to do more of it and be flexible.

I want to ask you a question that comes straight out of your opening remarks. You said welfare is only 1 percent of the Federal budget. What do you consider welfare?

Mr. SYNAR. I think this is an important distinction that the two parties have. You would claim that it is \$200 to \$300 billion a year because you would include into it the entitlements of housing, and yet only one-third of welfare recipients use housing. You would also include job training and community service of which no direct money goes to individuals. You would also include Pell grants and hot lunch programs which serve nonpoor individuals.

Mr. DELAY. How about food stamps? Is that welfare?

Mr. SYNAR. The major issue is that your figure is at \$300 billion.

Mr. DELAY. No, no, my question is, what is welfare?

Mr. SYNAR. Let me finish what you have included in your number.

Mr. DELAY. No, I did not ask you about my number, Mr. SYNAR. I asked you about your number.

□ 2020

Mr. SYNAR. Well, my number says the Medicaid number, which you include in there, is probably the most useless number in the facts.

Mr. DELAY. I am sorry, Mr. SYNAR, maybe I am hard of hearing or hard of talking. But I am asking, you said welfare is only 1 percent of the Federal budget. Now I am asking you, is food stamps welfare?

Mr. SYNAR. No.

Mr. DELAY. Food stamps is not welfare. Is Medicaid welfare?

Mr. SYNAR. No, not all of it. Yet you have included all of those numbers, those total numbers, as a total welfare picture.

Mr. DELAY. It is an entitlement, is it not?

Mr. SYNAR. If the gentleman would allow me, if only a third of the welfare recipients get housing, if 70 percent of Medicaid goes to disabled and elderly, to claim them as welfare is not correct.

Mr. DELAY. But all that money goes to welfare recipients.

Mr. SYNAR. No, it does not go to welfare recipients. Seventy percent of the Medicaid budget goes to the elderly and disabled. Do you consider them welfare?

Mr. DELAY. If they are on Medicaid, they are on welfare, yes.

Mr. SYNAR. So all elderly who get Medicaid by the Republican definition are on welfare.

Mr. DELAY. It is means tested. Those that are poor, elderly, that receive Medicaid, not Medicare, are on welfare. So you don't consider—let me get this straight—you don't consider Medicaid welfare. You don't consider food stamps welfare. Do you consider any nutrition, like school lunch, any of that? Housing you say is not welfare. If we pay \$13,000 for an apartment in New York City for a welfare mother, that is not welfare, because that is housing?

Mr. SYNAR. Let me correct you again, if I could. Only one-third of the welfare recipient get housing.

Mr. DELAY. Let's take the one-third. Are those one-third on welfare by getting housing?

Mr. SYNAR. They are on welfare only under the definition of aid for dependent children.

Mr. DELAY. OK. You said in your opening remarks that you require work. How do you require work in your proposals, or any of the proposals that have been made. How do you require work?

Mr. SYNAR. There are many proposals on the table, the Republicans have offered some, the President will offer others.

Mr. DELAY. The one you referred to.

Mr. SYNAR. Basically what I think the Democratic position is, is that we

think it should be flexible, that each individual welfare recipient will have unique needs.

Mr. DELAY. So you don't require work?

Mr. SYNAR. Yes, we do require work.

Mr. DELAY. How?

Mr. SYNAR. We say, after 2 years in many of the proposals, where work is available and people are qualified, that we should encourage that.

Mr. DELAY. So you don't require work.

Mr. SYNAR. Yes, we do require work, in many of the proposals that the Democrats propose.

Mr. DELAY. If you encourage it and they don't work and there are jobs available, what kind of sanctions do you bring against the welfare recipient?

Mr. WALKER. The time has expired. I will give the gentleman a brief period to respond.

Mr. SYNAR. What is important for the gentleman from Texas to remember is that providing a person a job without adequate support through child care, health care, and a job that can pay a decent living guarantees that the person will be back in welfare. The Democratic Party believes we have to provide those kinds of support so we don't have the population sliding backward and forward.

Mr. WALKER. I will now recognize Mr. SYNAR to question Mr. DELAY for 4 minutes.

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. DELAY, there have been many in the Republican Party who have called for getting rid of all welfare benefits together and basically sending that money we are using for welfare recipients directly to the States to build orphanages and group houses.

Mr. DELAY. No one in this House, no Republican in this House, has ever said that, or has introduced a bill to that effect.

Mr. SYNAR. Let me suggest to you that you need to visit with your colleague from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], and the bill you cosponsored that would do exactly that.

Mr. DELAY. No, it wouldn't.

Mr. SYNAR. We are concerned as Democrats that that kind of proposal doesn't strengthen families.

Mr. DELAY. You are mischaracterizing Mrs. MEYERS' bill. Mrs. MEYERS' bill blockgrants what we now spend on welfare and sends it back to the States. It doesn't end welfare and cut it off and destroy it.

Mr. SYNAR. What we are concerned about is that the building of orphanages and group housing and tearing families apart is counterproductive to the family values we think both parties stand for.

How do you justify the building of orphanages and group houses with the context of trying to build a strong social family unit?

Mr. DELAY. Well, first I believe when you give somebody something, they will take it, and sell you their soul in the taking. And our present welfare system, that has been passed by Democrats, supported by Democrats, and expanded by Democrats, has created a whole culture of people that has created generation after generation of people that are really unfortunate to be in their present situation.

You have destroyed their self-esteem by such a system. You have destroyed their dignity. And what we want to do is return it by requiring responsibility. And we say you have got to sign the social contract. If you are going to receive the largesse of the American taxpayers, then you have got to establish some way of showing that you are going to show responsibility in pulling yourself out of your present situation.

Mr. SYNAR. You talk about creating a system where people are not dependent. In fact, your colleagues tonight have really been arguing that these Government programs promote that dependency. You are familiar that the American taxpayers in the decade of the eighties, to the tune of billions of dollars, subsidized the cattle industry, the timber industry, the mining industry.

Why is it that Republicans by and large ignore corporate welfare and seem to want to pick on women who are working and trying to provide for their families?

Mr. DELAY. Well, what Republicans are for is to protect those that earn a living from the largesse of the Government and more taxes, as outlined by your side, to give to those that may not work for that which they receive.

We are saying we can do both. We are saying that we can give 2 years to those that are down and out to get themselves together and look for a job and work themselves out of their present situation. But in 2 years, they will either have to have a job in the private sector, or they will have to work for their benefits.

I don't think that is much to ask. It is a typical Democrat ploy to pit those that earn a living against those that have no living.

Mr. SYNAR. I described the philosophy of the Republicans earlier as really the party that wants to cut people off. I think the Democratic Party represents the party of prevention and trying to prevent welfare in the beginning. That is why our party overwhelmingly supported the earned income tax credit for working families and family and medical leave, as well as the raising of the minimum wage.

The Republicans have traditionally overwhelmingly not supported those proposals.

Mr. DELAY. Au contraire. Au contraire. The Republicans introduced the ITC, investment income tax credits, under Reagan, under Bush, helped

the Democrats pass it, and have always supported the ITC.

Mr. SYNAR. They had the opportunity about 18 months ago on this floor, and not one Republican voted for it.

Mr. DELAY. No, no, no, no, no.

Mr. SYNAR. And not one Republican voted for the earned income tax credit.

Mr. DELAY. Please. If we are going to do something like that, you put EITC expansion in a huge, huge tax bill that you know the Republicans, who are always against raising taxes, would not support.

Mr. WALKER. Time has expired. The moderator now recognizes Ms. MOLINARI to question Mr. MCCURDY for 4 minutes.

Ms. MOLINARI. Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

Mr. MCCURDY, do you believe in establishing time limits for individuals to get off welfare?

Mr. MCCURDY. I do. I support the President's proposal. There ought to be a 2-year time limit.

Ms. MOLINARI. Do you agree that we should establish paternity before we provide benefits?

Mr. MCCURDY. I do. My State, Oklahoma, has a requirement of such. When President Clinton was Governor of Arkansas, he recommended, and they established, such a requirement as well, and it is in every bill that I am proposing and the recommendation that the White House is for as well.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. MCCURDY, Do you believe that access to welfare should be cut off to noncitizens at a certain point?

Mr. MCCURDY. In the bill that I am going to introduce, we propose that as one of the options of funding. But I think there is a real problem here. And that is since you come from a State with a large immigrant population as well, that you have to avoid cost shifting.

We talk about unfunded mandates. We don't want to just cost-shift a huge cost on the States and cities. And the courts, as you recall, in Plyler versus Doe, has a requirement that we provide education, even to illegal immigrants. So I think there has to be some balance in this approach, and I think we have to have a standard for citizenship as well.

Ms. MOLINARI. So you do believe we should have a standard for citizenship. You do believe we should establish and insist on paternity. You do believe we should establish time limits. Mr. MCCURDY, on the basis of what we have heard tonight, you appear to be on the wrong side of the aisle.

Mr. MCCURDY. Actually, I have a number of your colleagues and Republicans, and quite frankly, Ms. MOLINARI, I was hoping I could also get you before this is over on our bill as well. I believe there should be a bipartisan solution to the welfare problem.

Ms. MOLINARI. I am delighted to hear you say that.

Mr. MCCURDY. And as the President called for an many of us embrace.

Ms. MOLINARI. I am delighted to hear you say that. May I suggest, however, as a result of what we have heard tonight and in the debate that has taken place before, that you spend a lot more time concentrating on the Members on your side of the aisle than on our side of the aisle, because the majority of the Republicans are in support and on the bill.

But I would like to talk a little bit about, and I commend you for your bill and the fact you have actually got something down on paper that we can talk about. And I am really sorry that the President of the United States did not have time to do that before tonight.

But with some of the things that have been coming out through the grapevine, we do understand that the President, and correct me if I am wrong, agrees for a 2 year and off, but that it would only apply to those people in the United States who were born after 1972.

□ 2030

Mr. MCCURDY. 1971, actually, which makes them 25 years of age. And when you are looking at financing welfare reform, I think the American public, and I think Republicans have agreed as well, that there is some cost in order to do that, if you are going to provide training, if you are going to provide ways to overcome these obstacles to work. So there is an issue of how much of the population you can actually phase in or address at any one time.

Ms. MOLINARI. There is also another question about how disingenuous the Clinton plan is, because it does, in fact, exempt over 75 percent of the participants in the program today. And it does cost \$58 billion. How, in fact, does President Clinton plan to pay for \$58 billion in new costs toward allegedly reforming welfare?

Mr. MCCURDY. I look forward to getting my chance to ask you the very question about your bill. In fact, the administration's proposal recognizes the difficulty of moving this burden on to the States. If we do it too quickly, if we are not careful, then we will overwhelm them and create even more of a problem.

Ms. MOLINARI. You are saying new taxes to me, Mr. MCCURDY.

Mr. MCCURDY. The President has made a commitment not to have any new taxes in the bill. We made that decision as well in the bill that I am introducing.

Let me just add, in the bill that the mainstream forum is proposing and many Democrats—

Ms. MOLINARI. I understand that President Clinton understands to fund some of his so-called promises—

Mr. WALKER. The time has expired. The moderator now recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY] to question the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] for 4 minutes.

Mr. MCCURDY. Do not go away, Ms. MOLINARI.

Ms. MOLINARI. I am not going anywhere.

Mr. MCCURDY. You seem to indicate that the Republican bill is, I assume, the Santorum bill, which has a large number of cosponsors. Are you a cosponsor of that bill?

Ms. MOLINARI. No, I am not at this point.

Mr. MCCURDY. Maybe you would like to explain the problems with it.

Ms. MOLINARI. I sure would. I appreciate your asking that question.

It is true that we have talked an awful lot about some drastic changes to our national system. And when I first heard some of the proposals that the Republicans put forth, I did, in fact, step back and said I wanted to analyze, I wanted to make sure that the impact on everyone who receives this funding or would have that funding terminated would be done in the best interests of all Americans, including those people who receive benefits today.

I have to tell you though, Mr. MCCURDY, that since I studied this issue in preparing for this debate and started really studying the Republican proposal and, certainly, as a result of everything that I have heard between the Democrats and Republicans today, that I intend to sign onto the Republican bill as a sponsor first thing tomorrow morning.

Mr. MCCURDY. Can you tell us how much the bill cost?

Ms. MOLINARI. The bill cost \$6 billion.

Mr. MCCURDY. \$6 billion, and you raise \$21.3 billion in cutting off benefits to noncitizens.

Ms. MOLINARI. That is correct.

Mr. MCCURDY. You say you have a \$21 billion surplus. Where do you get the rest of the funding?

Ms. MOLINARI. We are working with the Congressional Budget Office figures that state that it would, in fact, cost \$6 billion to implement the plan and that over a very short period of time, which is 5 years, we would see over a \$20 billion surplus by restricting access to noncitizens of the United States.

Mr. MCCURDY. When I visited the GAIN Program in Riverside, CA, which you have—

Ms. MOLINARI. Let me just also add that we do, in fact, I think we agree on this, know we are going to realize immediate savings as soon as we embark on establishing paternity and making some young men in America finally pay for the responsibilities that they carelessly created.

Mr. MCCURDY. That point we have already agreed upon.

When I visited the GAIN Program, which most analysts today cite as a success story, they still indicate that 50 percent of the population that would be eligible to participate in the program is now in deferral because of problems with drugs, legal problems, teenage mothers, pregnancy or whatever. Fifty percent is not even being able to participate. What do we do for a population like that? Are we prepared then to just say they are cast aside? That is a problem for both, if we are trying to achieve some solution.

Ms. MOLINARI. First of all, No. 1, we do exempt the disabled. Second of all, the situation that I think is very serious, which the Republicans do stress, and that is drug addicts or alcoholics who receive benefits must enroll in a treatment program in order to receive their benefits. That is certainly and arguably in the best interest of the U.S. taxpayer and the person who may need to be forced into treatment at a certain point.

Mr. MCCURDY. What percentage of the population that you now consider to be on welfare, by whatever definition you want to use, if you want to throw in housing and all of the other entitlements—

Ms. MOLINARI. I think we use other definitions—

Mr. WALKER. Mr. MCCURDY controls the time.

Mr. MCCURDY. In order to speed this up, because we want to get as much information out as we possibly can, what percentage of the total population do you believe that your bill would be able to move off of welfare based on this result?

Ms. MOLINARI. We certainly believe that the majority of individuals will be able to move off welfare in the near future. One of the things that I think Republicans rely on very clearly is the good faith of the American people that given an opportunity for a job—

Mr. MCCURDY. If I may, New York, Oklahoma, we are still trying to figure out the accents.

Mr. WALKER. Time has expired, without the accents being resolved.

The moderator will now proceed for final arguments, recognizing first the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR] to speak against the resolution for 2½ minutes.

Mr. SYNAR. Thank you.

Webster defines welfare as the state of being or doing well, a condition of health, happiness, and comfort, well-being.

How could such a nice word take on such a negative meaning. These days welfare is usually used as a cuss word. We have all heard the conversations. They are lazy. They have kids in order to get a check. They are totally irresponsible.

The simple fact is that as long as Government welfare programs are seen as subsidies for idleness, they will con-

tinue to be unpopular with most Americans.

Democrats believe there is a better way. Welfare reform universal health care, and a package of education and training programs that clearly emphasize the dignity of work and the need to reward workers.

Let us never forget that, first and foremost, we need to demand personal and parental responsibility and to ensure that people do not slide back into welfare. Let us also not forget three principles: Health care for all workers, safe, quality child care, and a stable job that pays enough to keep a family afloat.

Together we must change what is not working, and we must keep what is working. There are no sacred cows. There are only sacred truths.

We invite the Republicans and all Americans to join with us. Our simple goal for welfare reform, make work pay. Then and only then can we return the word welfare to its original and noble meaning.

Mr. WALKER. The moderator now recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] in a final argument to speak for the resolution for 2½ minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Thank you, Mr. Moderator.

I congratulate all the participants of this three-way debate, our side and the two sides on the Democrats' side.

Make work pay. Hang on to your wallets, because all I heard was more programs, more spending, they call investments, more of the same but more expanded of the same. And then we are going to encourage people to get a job, and the whole definition has been tried, frankly, time and time immemorial, a program that at its inception, carried by the Democrats since the 1930's and supposed to be a compassionate safeguard against impoverishment of widowed mothers, has clearly become a program that is doing more harm than good.

Those in the system today are demoralized. Even the Democrats have acknowledged that tonight.

What they have failed to concede is that it is our Government that is making them that way. The Government has created a monster, and President Clinton wants more of it and bigger. He does not know how to end welfare as we know it. He and his Democrat colleagues want to create more welfare as we know it, and they to preserve more welfare as we know it.

They want to go in every direction at once. Today's welfare system has clearly done more harm than good, when we have created 12-year-olds having babies, 15-year-olds shooting each other, 17-year-olds dying of AIDS, and 18-year-olds who cannot read graduating with diplomas.

Instead, Republicans ask welfare recipients to engage in a social con-

tract—one of those that—if they are to receive the generosity of the American people, then they have to earn their benefits. We want to change the mind set and create a cycle of responsibility rather than dependency.

□ 2040

It is this cycle of dependency that breeds mediocrity and destroy the very inner selves of those trapped in its clutches. As Jack Kemp has said, rather than the safety net it was once intended to be, welfare has become a hammock.

Instead, we want welfare to be a trampoline. We want people to bounce out of welfare into productive lifestyles and be proud of themselves. We don't want them to have to sacrifice their souls and their human dignity. We want welfare to be good, rather than harmful.

Mr. WALKER. I would like to thank both the Republican and the Democratic team for a spirited and informative debate. The moderator appreciated the courtesies shown to each other. I ended up not being confused at all. I thank you for that.

I want to thank the leadership, both Democrat and Republican, for their cooperation in preparing for this debate. I hope that this debate has contributed to more Americans understanding the complexities of the welfare system, and the proposals for welfare reform.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EWING) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STRICKLAND) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOAGLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAUGHLIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WALKER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EWING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. DORNAN.

Mr. SHUSTER in two instances.
Mr. KING.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. HYDE.
Mr. DREIER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STRICKLAND) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
Mr. TUCKER in three instances.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Ms. ESHOO in three instances.
Mr. SANGMEISTER.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. BRYANT.
Ms. MALONEY in two instances.
Mr. SAWYER.
Mr. COPPERSMITH.
Mr. WILSON.
Mr. FINGERHUT.
Mr. COYNE.
Miss COLLINS of Michigan.
Mr. RICHARDSON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.
Mr. WELDON.
Mr. THOMPSON.
Mr. TORRES.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 146. Joint resolution designating May 1, 1994, through May 7, 1994, as "National Walking Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 5, 1994, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3105. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report on the evaluation of the FHIP private enforcement initiative testing demonstration; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3106. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—student assistance general provisions, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3107. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—student assistance general provisions—Campus Security Act, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3108. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations—State Postsecondary Review Pro-

gram, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3109. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations—Federal family Education Loan Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3110. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations—Institutional Eligibility Under the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3111. A letter from the Chairman, First South Production Credit Association, transmitting the annual report of the Production Credit Association—Fifth Farm Credit District retirement plan for 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3112. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3113. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the 11th annual report of accomplishments under the Airport Improvement Program for the fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(2); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3114. A letter from the U.S. Trade Representative, transmitting a report on action taken as a result of the six investigations initiated in 1989 on priority practices identified under the statute commonly known as Super 301; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3115. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain military activities of the Department of Defense; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Post Office and Civil Service.

3116. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on the environmental assessment of urgent-relief acceptance of foreign research reactor spent nuclear fuel; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABO: Committee of Conference. Conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 218. Resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999 (Rept. 103-490). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4278. A bill to make improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act (Rept. 103-491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 416. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4296) to make unlawful the transfer or possession of assault weapons (Rept. 103-492). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 417. Resolution waiving

points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 636) to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit individuals to have freedom of access to certain medical clinics and facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-493). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 418. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, and providing that rule XLIX shall not apply with respect to the adopting of that conference report (Rept. 103-494). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALLENGER (for himself, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 4337. A bill to repeal the Displaced Workers Protection Act of 1994 (District of Columbia Act 10-193); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DE LUGO:

H.R. 4338. A bill to designate the "Christiansted Bandstand" at the Christiansted National Historic Site, St. Croix, VI, as the "Peter G. Thurland, Sr., Bandstand"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 4339. A bill authorizing the Davy Crockett Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial to honor Davy Crockett in the District of Columbia or its environs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 4340. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the percentage of completion method of accounting shall not be required to be used with respect to contracts for the manufacture of property if no payments are required to be made before the completion of the manufacture of such property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 4341. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to qualify additional institutions for programs under part B of title III of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4342. A bill to qualify Martin University of Indianapolis, IN, for participation in the program under part B of title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORNAN (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEVY, Mr. KING, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. COX, and Mrs. BENTLEY):

H.R. 4343. A bill to encourage liberty inside the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEVY (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. BRYANT):

H.R. 4344. A bill to prohibit ticket resale profiteering in or affecting interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUINN (for himself, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. FURSE, Mr. KING, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM,

Ms. LOWEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LEVY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. McHALE):

H.R. 4345. A bill to prohibit the distribution or receipt of restricted explosives without a Federal permit, and to require applications for such permits to include a photograph and the fingerprints of the applicant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SHEPHERD:

H.R. 4346. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Defense from transporting across State lines chemical munitions in the chemical weapons stockpile, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mr. PENNY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. EWING, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. EVERETT):

H.R. 4347. A bill to amend title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 to permit the conversion of wetlands that are 1 acre or less in size; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 4348. A bill to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit proxy voting and to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize the practice commonly called ghost voting in the House of Representatives; jointly, to the Committees on Rules and the Judiciary.

By Ms. SHEPHERD (for herself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Ms. FURSE, and Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona):

H.R. 4349. A bill to prohibit the Department of Defense from conducting flight tests of certain missiles that would result in the release of debris outside a designated Department of Defense test range; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUYER, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARR, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLINGER, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DARDEN, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LANTOS,

Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MACHTEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PORTER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REED, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VALENTINE, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLF, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to designate October 1994 as "Crime Prevention Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KYL:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution to condemn the March 1, 1994, attack on American Lubavitcher students; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 123: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.
H.R. 546: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. HOAGLAND.
H.R. 702: Mr. KING.
H.R. 790: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 963: Mr. ROGERS.
H.R. 1145: Mr. McCANDLESS and Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 1277: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1322: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 1349: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 1785: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.
H.R. 2444: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. KIM, and Mr. GUNDERSON.
H.R. 2467: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. TEJEDA.
H.R. 2670: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 2866: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2930: Ms. DELAULO.
H.R. 2957: Mr. GUNDERSON and Mr. BLILEY.
H.R. 3075: Mr. LEHMAN.
H.R. 3179: Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 3214: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3261: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PARKER, Mr. LEVY,

Mr. CLAY, Mr. GORDON, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CANADY, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 3290: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 3305: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 3310: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3320: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BEILENSEN, and Mr. THOMAS of California.

H.R. 3486: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MACHTEY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 3513: Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 3627: Mr. BALLENGER and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 3784: Mr. PACKARD and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 3811: Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3820: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. REGULA, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 3860: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 3870: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 3942: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 3978: Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 3992: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 4050: Mr. MANTON and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 4074: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. QUINN, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. KLING, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 4114: Mr. BECERRA, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. YATES, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 4162: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 4198: Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 4213: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4237: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. BYRNE, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 4247: Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 4249: Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 4257: Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.R. 4311: Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.J. Res. 209: Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. SHARP, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.J. Res. 231: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.J. Res. 276: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Ms. SNOWE.

H.J. Res. 297: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.J. Res. 314: Mr. REED and Mr. McHALE.

H.J. Res. 328: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. MANTON.

H.J. Res. 333: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SWETT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SKEEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. REED, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. SANDERS.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. WYDEN.

H. Con. Res. 84: Mrs. BYRNE and Mr. GORDON.

H. Con. Res. 168: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Con. Res. 212: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. TUCKER.

H. Con. Res. 217: Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. PARKER, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. GEJDESON.

H. Con. Res. 234: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. WILSON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 234: Mr. STEARNS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. HUFFINGTON.

H. Res. 362: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.

H. Res. 383: Mr. FAWELL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 140: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 3222: Mr. KOLBE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

90. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Palau National Congress, P.O. Box 8, Koror, Republic of Palau, relative to the sincere gratitude and appreciation of the people of the Republic of Palau to the Honorable RON DE LUGO, the U.S. Virgin Islands' Delegate; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.